Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by

C. C. Robinson, Esq.,

Christopher Robinson Esq
Beverley House
Dec. 1903

Bought for charity.
Lent for malignity.
Returned for keeps.
T. C. S.

8-11
48-9
87-9
124-32.
143-56.
188-205

T.

CANADIAN POLITICS

BY

J. ROBERT LONG

WITH SPEECHES
BY THE LEADERS OF REFORM AND PROGRESS
IN CANADIAN POLITICS AND
GOVERNMENT

15 6821
27/10/20

ST. CATHARINES, ONT.
THE JOURNAL OF ST. CATHARINES, LIMITED
1903

F
5081
L6
cop. 2

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada
in the year 1903, by J. ROBERT LONG,
at the Department of Agriculture.

THE IDEAL PARLIAMENT.
Hon. D. C. Fraser 140

THE TWO POLICIES.
Sir Richard Cartwright 143

EARLY STRUGGLES OF REFORMERS.
Hon. Alex. Mackenzie 157

IMPORTANT ASSETS.
Hon. J. M. Gibson 167

THE PREFERENTIAL TARIFF.
Hon. Wm. Paterson 170

THE FUTURE OF CANADA.
Hon. Geo. W. Ross 177

STABILITY OF TARIFFS.
Hon. W. S. Fielding 188

DALTON McCARTHY ON PROTECTION 193

SLAVERY AND PROTECTION.
G. W. W. Dawson, ex-M. P. 194

THE NATIONAL POLICY AND THE FARMER.
J. N. Grieves, ex- M. P. 196

THE LIBERAL PARTY.
Sir Richard Cartwright 202

THE NATIONAL POLICY.
Hon. David Mills 206

FARMERS AND THE TARIFF.
Hon Sydney Fisher 214

QUALITIES OF A GREAT STATESMAN.
Hon. Geo. W. Ross 217

THE CONSERVATIVE POLICY.
Hon. Alex. Mackenzie 2

PREFACE.

One of the Greek philosophers has written "All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of the empire depends upon the education of the youth." Cicero says "Be a pattern to others and all will go well; for as a whole city is affected by the licentious passions and vices of great men so it is likewise reformed by their moderation."

Just as a nation will be affected by the incompetency and evils of a bad administration so will it become great and prosperous by the good and wise legislation of its administrators, and since an administration is but a reflex of the people how very important it is that the people read, think and act for themselves and those who are to partake of their names and their blood.

Though I may not be able to inform men more than they know, yet I may by this work give them occasion to think, hence this volume is particularly written to educate and inspire the young men of Canada upon whose good or bad performances of public duties depends the future greatness or weakness of our country.

Although it may be charged that I have been led by the indiscreetness of party passion, I must say that I never engaged in a work in which I desired to be more accurate, or in which I have been more solicitous to terminate with honor and dignity.

The protection of the liberty of Canadians is a duty we owe to ourselves who enjoy it and to our posterity who will claim at their hands, this the best birthright and noblest inheritance of mankind.

Living in the possession of peace and happiness and liberty, under the guidance of a mild and beneficent religion; protected by impartial laws and the purest administration of justice; under a system of government which our present experiences lead us to pronounce the best and wisest that has ever been framed and which is the admiration of the world, shall we not as loyal Canadians, true to our forefathers, to ourselves and our posterity, exert every honorable and legitimate effort to perpetuate the same?

That this volume will contribute to some extent in that direction the author earnestly hopes.

CANADIAN POLITICS

CHAPTER I.

We are told by a certain class of people that there is no necessity for party organization in Canada, but when it is understood that nearly all the good that has been achieved by parliaments has been attained by party combinations and connections, readers will admit that party government is a necessity and will exist so long as there are people to be governed.

Now what is a party?

A party is an instrument, and an instrument is a thing ordained for a certain end. It is like a tool that the mechanic uses; it is no use in itself, but it is of use in the hands of those who wield it.

We have before us two instruments in the hands of the people. We have the Liberal instrument and we have the Conservative instrument, Both of these purport and profess to be instruments for attaining and working out the public good.

Now what is the public good?

Where are you to look for it?

We are not to look for it in promises and anticipations, not in the mere froth of light phrases and sanguine minds, but in the light of experience, in the history and traditions of our country.

The Liberal party is composed of one set of individuals, the Conservative party of another, and we are to look at these two sets as we would look at the tool, and see for ourselves which has done the best work. If your verdict finds favor with the Liberal party and its principles, then it becomes your duty to commit the future care of your province and country to a Liberal administration; if your verdict finds favor with the Conservative party and its principles, then it becomes your duty to commit the future care of your province and country to a Conservative administration. We are also to look at these two parties and see which of them has carried out the best and most enlightened measures for the benefits of the people and whose principles are at the present time best constituted to meet the needs of the hour and the needs of future generations so far as we can see.

Before proceeding with the records of these parties it will be well to impress upon the reader what importance attaches itself to the representation of a constituency in our Houses of Parliament, Scarcely any higher honor can be conferred upon an individual than to be selected from among his fellowmen to represent and guide the destinies of a great and free people. Scarcely any duty can be more sacred than to elect men to Parliament to perform the work of a great and growing country, and upon whose good or bad performance of that work will depend the lightening or the aggravating of the burdens of life for ourselves and our children through generations yet to come.

We say therefore to the tens of thousands of young men who stand every year upon the threshold of manhood and who are called upon to make their choice of the parties with which they shall cast their lots and their activities, consider these grave responsibilities to the best of your ability; with that judgment which will enable you to discharge your public duties in consonance with your convictions of what is best in the interests of the public good.

Let us take the policies adopted by these two political parties and contrast their promises with their results.

The policy of the Conservative party, under the leadership of the late Sir John A. Macdonald, announced prior to the general elections of 1878 would

Abolish business depression.

Stop the exodus.

Turn the balance of trade in our favor.

Tax British goods in bulk less than foreign.

Give the farmer a home market.

Develop our mineral wealth.

Obtain reciprocity with the United States.

Reduce the debt to $100,000,000 by 1890.

Place a million people in the Northwest by 1891.

Cause the erection of tall chimneys and give employment to thousands of men, who, it was claimed, were forced to seek employment in the United States.

The policy of the Liberal party, adopted at a national convention of Liberals at Ottawa, in the month of June, 1893, embodied the following resolutions:—

"That the tariff should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

"That having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them.

"That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great national resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the Government of both countries and would promote those kindly relations between the Empire and the Republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity:

"That any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

"That this convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public monies, which for years past has existed under rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of enquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada,

"That we demand the strictest economy in the ad-

ministration of the government of the country.

"That the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

"That in view of the fact that the Dominion Franchise Act has since its introductory cost the Dominion Treasury over one million dollars, and that each revision involves an additional expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars, and that its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, it is the opinion of the convention that the act should be repealed and we should revert to the Provincial Franchise.

"That to put an end to the Gerrymander acts it is desirable that county boundaries should be preserved in electoral divisions, and that in no case should parts of different counties be put in one electoral division:

"That the constitution of the Senate should be amended so as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government."

The merits of these two policies we shall discuss further on in this work.

CHAPTER II.

It is our purpose now to discuss the principles of freer trade and those of high tariffs, which have long been, and still are, the real issues between the two parties. We will first review the experience of England under both of these systems and compare her position and conditions with the position and conditions of the United States, which has always been a highly protected country, because these two countries, being the two great factors in commerce will serve to illustrate by figures, and conditions which we all know to exist, the results of their respective policies.

Under the most stringent system of protection ever known in Great Britain, the growth of British exports, commencing with the year 1805, with $190,000,000, in 1825 was $194,000,000, a net increase in twenty years of $4,000,000, or at the rate of $200,000 per annum.

Under a somewhat reduced protective tariff as to manufactures, but with duties ranging from 20 to 30 per cent., British exports increased from $194,000,000 in 1825 to $237,000,000 in 1842, a net increase in 17 years of $43,000,000, or at the rate of about $2,500,000 per year.

After protection to manufactures had been substantially abandoned in 1842, but while protection to agriculture and shipping continued, exports increased

rapidly, rising from $237,000,000 in 1842, to $289,-000,000 in 1846, or to the extent of $52,000,000, a greater gain in four years than had been achieved in thirty-seven years of protection.

With further removals of restriction on British exchanges; on food products in 1846, and in shipping in 1849 the increase in the value of British exports was rapid and continuous, rising from $289,000,000 in 1846 to the enormous amount of $1,432,000,000 in 1880, to $3,315,000,000 in 1893.

The total increase of British exports and imports during its last thirty years of protection was as nearly as real values can be ascertained, about $346,000,000.

The like increase in the first three years of free trade was $2,400,000,000, or seven times as large as under the thirty years of protection.

Between the years 1816 and 1840, under the restrictive system, a period of twenty-four years, the total increase of British tonnage was only 80,000 tons. In 1848, the last year of British Navigation Laws, the aggregate tonnage was 3,000,000 tons. In 1858 it was 4,651,000, an increase of 1,257,000 in ten years. In 1878 it was 5,780,000 and in 1880 it was 6, 574,000.

Previous to the repeal of the British Corn Laws the wealth of Great Britain increased at a slower rate than population.

Since 1849 the increase of the population has been in the ratio of about 33 per cent., the wealth 130 per cent. In 1841 the capital of British Savings Bank

was $120,000,000, in 1880 it was $388,000,000. In 1850 there were 920,000 paupers in England and Wales, and in 1893, notwithstanding the population increased about 33 per cent, there were but 803,000 paupers. In 1850 there were 51,000 convictions for crime and in 1893 there were but 9,797.

While it is true that the United States has become a great and powerful nation under the system of protection, its effect upon the great masses of the people has been most disastrous. Large manufacturing establishments in every part of the country are frequently standing idle or working on short time, their workmen serving at reduced wages, while strikes, lockouts, riots, murder and bloodshed fill the pages of her annual records. Large numbers of her people are without employment, their wives and children are begging for bread through her streets, and honest men in their efforts to secure employment are being imprisoned for vagrancy.

But, lest the reader should suppose that I am, for my own ends, misrepresenting the real condition of the people of that country, I desire to give you the most unimpeachable testimony in the shape of an extract from a speech delivered in Congress by Mr. Ward, an eminent American politician who dared to speak of the situation in the United States as follows:

"We are all familiar with the accounts of unparalleled and increasing destitution among our own working population. Let not repetition dull our minds so that we cannot see, nor steel our hearts so that we

cannot feel, the force of facts so often told and so well authenticated.

"Multitudes of temperate, industrious, and well-trained mechanics, and of young women of honourable independence of character and sensitive about receiving charity in any form or shape, have lost all hope, and in the depths of destitution and despair are begging to be saved from lingering death from hunger by being sent to places intended for the reception of vagrants and criminals.

"The representatives of the Boston Board of Trade assert that the people of Massachusetts are deeply impressed, as are many others in all parts of our country, with the fact that difficulties and depreciation are besetting every branch of industry. These formidable disasters are not confined to the great cities, but even in the smaller manufacturing towns, also, are found people seeking for work, and the general cry is: 'It is our trade relations that are wrong and unsound; what have you to suggest to lift us out of the slough of despond?'

"In this prospect are the facts as we now find them to be thrust aside as if of no moment, in the present depressed condition of our trade and manufactures? Year after year the plight of our laboring men throughout the country, and especially in the regions dependent on manufactures and commerce, has grown worse and worse. Year by year since 1872 the attractions presented to the laborers of Europe have sensibly diminished, until in the last fiscal year the immigrants to our shores were less by nearly

three hundred thousand than they were four years ago, the actual reduction within that time having been from 437,750 to 169,986. These new comers go, it is to be supposed, to friends who are ready to receive them, chiefly in those parts of the country least affected by the prevalent distress."

Need I say that a perpetuation of the present fiscal policy of the United States will sooner or later shatter the foundations of its political systems; that unless a revolution of ideas, tempered by education and worked out through the ballot, soon overtakes that country it will be plunged into deadly turmoil, from which it will take years to recover. By nothing short of a complete change in its fiscal policy can the mischiefs that have been done by an unwise and meddlesome policy be corrected. This is not a matter of doubt. The daily records and the tendencies of the time afford ample proof that a revolution is inevitable. Not only must this obnoxious system be abolished by the United States, it must be abolished by the nations of the world, for until this hindrance to trade created by hostile tariffs is removed, the time will never come when the intelligence and the true interests of nations will overcome the motives and passions which plunge them into war and the pestilence and famine which follow in its trail.

The imposition of heavy duties on foreign manufactures simply taxes the consumers in the country where this tax is levied. But, says the advocate of high tariffs—we will increase our industry and manufactures by this duty. How, I ask, are we going to

do it? We simply take the duty, or taxes, from the consumer and give it to the other, the producer. There are only two results, as plain to be seen as the light of day. The first is that we have products to export and having a high tariff against us we find ourselves with an over production; secondly, we lessen the home demand for we have put obstacles in the way of the consumer in buying, the same as we have in the way of the producer selling. What is the result? Our industries are in trouble, for being forced into an unnatural activity they produce more than we can consume, the home market becomes glutted, we have no foreign market to relieve us, our labor is only employed half the time and our wages are cut in two.

While I readily concede that we cannot have free trade, we can have freer trade and the more we reduce our taxation, the more freedom we extend to industry, the better the market and the more stable will be our institutions. Industry, having little restriction as to market, would have all the development of which it is capable, which would enable it to acquire a maximum of stability.

Freer trade, or a reduced system of taxation, is therefore an economical ideal, and should absorb the interest of all loyal and enthusiastic Canadians. We build telegraph and railway lines and we welcome the extension of steamship lines and other means of intercommunication with the nations of the world—to extend the sphere of exchanges. We recognize in these systems a powerful instrument in destroying the dis-

tances to the profit of the exchanges from city to city and from people to people. Now, is it wisdom to impose upon ourselves great sacrifices to multiply the ways to facilitate the exchanges and on the other hand to maintain a high tariff system to interrupt them? Such a flagrant contradiction must eventually impress all minds. Either we must cease the construction of the agents of civilization or we must continue to reduce our tariffs. We must see that high tariffs have brought nothing to the people, that they have robbed them of their natural rights and that it would be an excellent operation to substitute for them, revenue taxes. Sir Robert Peel took this position as the basis of his financial policy and the budgets of Great Britain whose accounts showed a continual deficit before the reforms of Peel afterwards presented, as I have already shown, in the preceding chapter, a regular surplus.

The abolition of the high tariffs to a moderate tariff would enable the nations of the world to trade freely with each other, would increase the commerce enormously and would gradually make them become like one grand nation. Their commercial interests would multiply on such a scale, their natural knowledge and intercourse would become so intimate that standing armies would be dissolved and labor would reap its just reward. Is not commerce the handmaid of freedom and civilization? Why then should nations build barriers against that commerce?

Until high tariff systems are abolished slavery will be but half abolished. Emancipation will be but half

completed, while millions of men, born to be free and equal, possessing the ballot, exercise their power in supporting policies and fads that deprive them of their liberties. In our fiscal systems, as in our laws, there should be order and security, that the lowest as well as the highest, the poor as well as the rich should be protected. That is liberty, the liberty for which our fathers fought and fell, and this is the liberty we can demand today through the ballot box and which it is the duty of every man to defend in every extremity.

CHAPTER III.

Let us now see how the promises of the fathers of the National Policy contrast with the experiences.

Instead of reducing the debt of $140,362,069 in 1878 to $100,000,000 by 1890 as this National Policy was to have done, the records show that it was more than doubled during these years. The exodus was to have been stopped and tall chimneys were to be erected all over the country and an all absorbing market would be created for the farmer, "Our workmen," said Sir John Macdonald, "can be fully employed if we encourage our manufacturers, they will not go over to the United States to add wealth and strength to a foreign country and to deprive us of that strength and wealth." In his resolution in 1878 he said: "Such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home." But what are the facts? Instead of stopping the exodus, we find it increased. The Government's records show that during the ten years 1881 to 1891, 886,000 immigrants came into Canada. Allowing the natural growth to be expected from our own population during the same period we should have added some 604,000 to the returns of 1881. These two totals would have shown an increase in 1891 of 1,490,000 over the returns of 1881. But what do the census takers discover? Why, that 980,-

000 persons born in Canada were residents of the United States and that about one million and a half children had been born unto these residents since they had become citizens of that country.

But what were the conditions of the workingmen under this system that Sir John Macdonald said would "fully employ the thousands of our fellow countrymen who were now obliged to seek employment in a foreign country?" Were they afforded employment here?

Let us consult two of their organs in that respect, two newspapers whose editoral columns, full of praise for the National Policy, in their news columns tell of the deplorable conditions which existed during its regime:

Toronto World.—"The City Engineer's Department is besieged every day with men seeking work, some of whom become abusive when they are not given it. Deputy Engineer Rust stated Saturday that the department is doing all it can to furnish employment, but there is very little civic work going on, outside the Island waterworks and the Rosedale ravine drive. All the men applying for work are sent to the foremen, who put their names upon the list and they receive work as their turn comes."

Toronto News.—"The problem of finding work for the unemployed of this city is beyond solution by the municipality, and if anything is to be done to relieve the distress of the thousands of worthy and honest people who do not know which way to turn for the commonest necessaries of life, the Government of

the Province must lend its aid. During the past few years the City Council has appropriated sums of ten and twenty thousand dollars for relief work, but this was only a drop in the bucket.

"It did not to any appreciable extent relieve the strain. An expenditure of ten thousand dollars meant only five or six dollars for the head of each family that was in need. And even this amount spent in useless work (as most of it was) was taken from taxpayers who were suffering almost as severely as the unemployed.

"The aldermen have not set the question aside without giving it consideration, for time and again it has been discussed with an earnest desire to find a remedy. For a period of two years Ald. Shaw and Ald. Lamb investigated every scheme that was suggested, and made enquiries from every source of information within their knowledge in an endeavor to inaugurate some plan that would bring about the desired result. But they failed, as anyone else who attempts to solve the riddle from a municipal standpoint.

"The city has not got the money for the work, and moreover, the city is not in any sense responsible for the congregation of unemployed in its limits. Thousands of those who are seeking aid from the civic department have been residents of the city for only two or three years. They have no claim on the charity of the taxpayers. They came from surrounding towns when times became hard, and they got out of work, with the hope that in the larger community they would have a better chance to find something to

do. In doing so they have made the competition that much keener for those who have been living here for many years. If the city services had to provide only for old residents, there would not be so much distress. It is the ingathering of the needy from every direction that renders the situation acute.

This being the case the matter becomes one for the Government of the Province to deal with. Seven-eighths of those who are in want are—and have been nearly all their lives—inhabitants of this Province, and the other eighth were brought here from Great Britain and Ireland with public funds. The responsibility of doing something for the relief therefore rests upon the Government."

Are these not powerful arguments against the National Policy? Conservative newspapers of the city of Toronto asking the Provincial Government to redress wrongs perpetrated by the Federal Government who "brought from Great Britain and Ireland with public funds" these unemployed! But that is not all. Here is another tale of woe from the Monetary Times of Toronto:—

"The employees of the Zoeliner furniture factory, Mount Forest, some 46 in number, married men and householders, have petitioned the council of the town to take into consideration, and if possible, adopt some means by which work at said factory may be resumed and employment offered them."

Do we read of such conditions today, under a reduced system of taxation? Is Canada not progressing more rapidly under a freer system of trade than ever

before? And is it not reasonable to expect that with a still freer trade policy, her development would be of a still more pronounced character? But strides in the matter of reducing tariffs must be gradual. They must come, and come they will. The sense of the people of the civilized nations of the world, will eventually demand the abolition of high tariffs.

Business depression would be abolished under the operation of the National Policy. But was it?

Taking the quarterly summary shown by the reports in the Monetary Times, given by the commercial agency of R. G. Dun & Co, ending March, 1896, we find a terrible list of failures. This report says: "One hundred and twenty-five merchants owing an average of $7,000 each and one hundred and eleven grocers and provision dealers, owing in all $350,000, have made assignments in the past three months. Fifty-seven dry goods dealers, forty-five hardware dealers and forty-four shoe merchants owing between them close upon a million and a half dollars, have come to grief in the same period of time." The total number of failures in this short space of time aggregated 738, owing $5,475,000 and showing assets of no more than $4,258,000. In the month of March, this same commercial agency reports that 109 chattel mortgages were given by farmers in Ontario in one day. The balance of trade which was to have been turned in our favor, one of the predictions, and one of the promises of the National Policy advocates was turned against us during its regime to the extent of $200,000,000.

The development of mines did not materialize and instead of a population of one million people in the Northwest it is notorious that there were less than two hundred and fifty thousand, so that on the whole, contrasting its promises with the results, Canada's experience with high tariffs has been a sad and deplorable one.

Not only did its system create trusts and monopolies, but it decreased the value of farm and other properties; it impeded our national progress; it discriminated against the mother country; it oppressed the masses of the people; it enriched the favored few, and made possible, curruption on a very great scale, so much so, that corruption perpetrated under its system has been the greatest blot upon the fair name of Canada; to wit—the McGreevy conspiracy and the Langevin-Caron reptile fund, the Curran Bridge Scandal, the Tay Canal Scandal, the St. Charles Branch Railway Scandal, the Little Rapids Lock Scandal, the Galop Rapids Channel Scandal, the Printing Bureau Scandal, the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Scandal, the Caraquet Railway Scandal and others that need not be mentioned.

A lucrative home market was promised to the farmers, but here again its operations failed. Never during our whole political history were farm products sold at prices so low as from the year 1884 to 1894, when wheat declined 31 per cent. per bushel, barley 24 per cent. per bushel, oats 15 per cent. per bushel, rye 24 per cent. per bushel and peas 22 per cent. per bushel. Protection therefore proved a failure to the

farmer, whose only hope lies in a freer trade policy giving him access to the markets of the world, particularly those of the United States.

CHAPTER IV.

The question is often asked why farm lands decreased in value. They decreased for the same reason that other stocks decreased—because the profit, after the expenses of working them was paid, was so small. Compare the returns from farm lands with the profits upon capital diverted by the protective policy into manufacturing industries. Remember that not only were the farm lands starved for want of money at a low rate in interest for their improvements, but in addition to being thus deprived of the use of the capital of the country, the farmers were obliged by high protection to pay the high rate of profit upon the capital invested in the tariff-fed manufacturing industries. For this reason the following comparison of profits will have great interest for the farmers and the great masses of our people whose welfare is bound up with that of the farmers.

According to the census of 1891 the manufacturers' condition in that year was as follows:

The capital invested amounted to	$353,837,000
Value of product.....	475,446,000
Cost of raw material	255,983,000
Cost of labor	99,763,000
Number of hands	367,000
Amount of profit after deducting raw material	219,463.000
Amount of profit per hand employed ...	596

Average wage paid each hand 272
Net amount of profit, deducting material and wages, per hand 324
Manufacturer's profit on capital, 34 per cent.

Take the farmer's investment for the year 1892 according to the Ontario Bureau of Industries-

Capital invested		$979,979,000
Value of crop products ...	$110,563,000	
Value of live-stock sold or killed for sale	32,454,000	
Gross value of products		$143,017,000
Less:		
Cost of seed	$12,050,000	
Cost of feeding animals sold or killed for sale	16,000,000	
		28,050,000
Net proceeds of the farms		$114,967,000

There were at this time 241,000 farm holders in the Province. It would require the labor of another man on an average on each farm which makes 482,000 hands. Divide the net proceeds by this number of hands and you have the sum of $238, which is the amount made per hand on the farm that year. The average wage for farm hands was $253 a year. The owner of the farm thus made out of his land $15 less than the wages of the laborer he employed to assist

him. The manufacturer on the other hand made $324 profit on every hand employed by him.

Surely this is sufficiently convincing to demonstrate the inequality of the operations of high tariff systems. Surely the men of this country whose positions demand close, honest toil, and upon whose liberty and success the wealth of this country, and its progress largely depends, will see from the above the fallacy of a system at once so full of convulsions, contradictions and absurdities.

Not only is the farmer confined to the home market under high tariffs, but the product of the manufacturers is also confined to the home market, the products of the factory being so costly that it cannot relieve itself by exportation, for in foreign markets it cannot compete with other non-protecting nations. Protection is evil and pernicious in principle and the evil has grown until by combination it yet seeks to defy the efforts of honest men to abolish it. There is only one true policy for the nations of the world—tariff for revenue. The experience of England affords ample proof of this; and yet it is apparent that some will not see it, for men are selfish and men are ignorant and the selfish act upon the ignorant and bewilder them. There is no meanness to which those who gain by tariff obstructions to trade will not stoop to continue a system by which they profit at the expense of the consuming public. Why a few men, protected under a high tariff system, should exercise the most base and abominable despotism over millions of their fellowmen, why innocence should

have been, and still is, the victim of such oppression, why industry should toil for rapine, why the harmless laborer should sweat for the benefits and the luxury and rapacity of tyrannic depredation—in a word, why millions of people gifted by God with the ordinary endowments of humanity should groan under a system of such despotism is more than is comprehensive.

CHAPTER V.

I have before me the campaign book of the Conservative party, used in the contest of 1896, entitled "Political Pointers for the Campaign." Among the various articles written to deceive the innocent man who accepts ready made ideas, and the ignorant who will refuse to weigh a criticism on its merit appears the following:

"There is not a thing produced in this country, from a pen-knife to a railway car, that has not been cheapened since the adoption of the National Policy.

"A revenue tariff," they say, "is always paid by the consumer. If you buy goods not produced in Canada you pay the price of such goods in the country in which they were made with the freight and duty added." They do not go on to say that even then that article reaches your hands as cheaply as it can be purchased here. They do not go on to say that even though that article could be produced here at the same price as it could be bought in that country, it is sold here at exactly the same price the foreign article, after duty and freight paid, would cost. Nor do they go on to say that this amount of money representing the duty and freight paid on the foreign article represents so much money taken from the consumer and put into the pockets of the home manufacturer. They do not go on to say that labor was comparatively as cheap here during the N. P. regime as it was in for-

eign countries, and that thousands of idle workingmen were always ready to compete against those who were fortunate enough to be employed, which had the effect of still cheapening labor.

On page seven of this same book, under a heading "What Tearing down Tariff Fences Mean," we read:

"A Grit friend said to us the other day that the object of the party to which he belonged, when they got in power, was to break down our tariff walls or fences. Now, fences are for two purposes. They are to keep things out or to keep them in, one or the other. The fence around the wheat field is to keep stock out, the fence around the pasture field is to keep stock in. What does tearing them down imply? That all the range stock outside will get into our pasture and that our cattle will share the range with them. Now, it would be quite right to suppose that there is not enough grass on the range for the cattle that are out there already, and we are justified in assuming that the grass inside our fences is better and the cattle sleeker and richer in condition than those out on the range. If we equalize these things and let these hungry cattle from the range into our enclosed fields, we woundn't have as much grass for own stock as we had before. Can our Grit friends see the point?"

But where is the point?

Let us just reverse the illustration. We will suppose that inside that fence the pastures are bad, as they were during the N. P. regime; that there is not room enough within it sufficient to enable the cattle

to make themselves "sleeker and richer in condition than those outside the fence and on free range," would you not "equalize these things" and let these hungry cattle in the enclosed range out into the free range that they might enjoy sufficient to make them sleeker and richer?" Can our Conservative friends see the point? We read elsewhere in their book that:

"The family circle is a charmed circle. Home and hearthstone are sacred words. Unity and exclusiveness, mutual aid and mutual defence are universally recognized safeguards of the family. The nation is a great family, entitled to all family privileges, and should guard her interests sacredly. Twenty-nine centuries ago Solomon wisely said: "In all labor there is profit," and as a family must labor or earn more than it expends, or it will cease to thrive, so must a nation produce more than it consumes, or it will decline in power and become extinct. A family has the right to protect itself against poverty by laboring to provide for its own necessities, and a nation has the right to prohibit the free importation and sale of cheaply-made foreign merchandise, the result of which is to force her own citizens into idleness and poverty. No family need be degraded by admitting improper persons to its circle, and no nation need be degraded by fostering pauper labor and degraded labor systems. The only safeguard is the enactment and enforcement of wise industrial laws."

With eighteen years' lease of power in which it was supposed the National Policy would have given the country such tariffs as would entitle her to all "fam-

ily privileges," why were some of its claims not made a monument to its principles?

"A nation must produce more than it consumes" is one of the arguments pointed to in this article. What! a protected country produce more than it can consume! Is this not one of the strongest arraignments the advocates of a freer trade system could make against high tariffs? Yet the advocates of the National Policy attempt to deceive the people by this statement. Such an argument is absurd. Unless we have a foreign market to relieve us of more than we can consume what is the result? Stagnation, closed factories, business depression, low wages, idle men, beggars, tramps, suicides, theft, crime, and over crowded jails would be inevitable.

I agree with the author of the Conservative campaign book that unless a country can produce more than it consumes it will decline in power and become extinct, but it is impossible for a country to produce more than it can consume and keep its people employed unless it can find a foreign market to relieve it of the over production.

I also admit that a family has the right to protect itself against poverty by laboring to provide for its necessities. This is wisdom, but I deny that it is right to protect one class of the community who are few, to the detriment of the masses who consume the products of the few. I deny the imputation that a reduced system of taxation would result in forcing our own citizens into idleness and poverty. The conditions of the Canadian people who are today enjoying

prosperity under a reduced system of taxation, is the strongest testimony to its advantages, the strongest condemnation against the system, which, during its regime, did force our citizens into idleness and poverty.

I further admit that "no family need be degraded by admitting improper persons to its circle," that "no nation need be degraded by fostering pauper labor and degraded labor systems." But is it not a remarkable fact that considering the Conservative party was in power for eighteen years and that it was in a position to frame a policy that would "enforce wise and industrial laws by prohibiting pauper labor and degraded labor systems," into our markets, it remained for the Liberal party to enact such legislation? In the closing pages of their campaign book they say:

"A self-evident truth is one which needs but to be stated to be accepted by candid, unprejudiced minds. We hold the following to be self-evident.

"If the Canadian people purchase from the United States ten million dollars worth of goods, Canada gets the goods and the United States get the ten million dollars in cash, but if we buy the same goods from Canadian producers, then Canada has both the goods and the money and is ten million dollars better off than by the former transaction."

But if under a more favorable system of tariffs we could sell ten million dollars worth of our goods to the United States, ten million more than we are selling today, would Canada not be better off by reason of that sale? And if our exports can be made to in-

crease under a favorable treaty with that country in a like proportion as they did during the twelve years treaty extending from 1854 to 1866, would it not be a wise thing for us to obtain such treaty? During the twelve years that treaty remained in operation our exports to the United States nearly quadrupled, rising from $10,473,000 in 1854 to $39,950,000 in 1866. With the increased population of that country and the many resources we have but recently discovered and with our immense industries, is it not reasonable to expect that such a treaty, or a freer trade policy would greatly stimulate our exports and our industrial trade?

Is it not a more probable conclusion that a market affording us opportunities of meeting the wants of seventy millions of people would be more beneficial to the producers of this country, than our markets of five millions would be to the producers of the United States? And who will deny that the brain, the brawn and resources of this country are in any degree inferior to those of the American Republic? Who will deny our administrators are not equally as competent to protect the interests of the great masses of our people as were the administrators of Great Britain, whose chief glory lies in its trade policy, dating back from the time of Peel? I say the Canadian people are quite competent to use the resources at their command and to use them wisely and well, and when the Conservative party speak of self-evident truths, why, I ask, do they stop at half-told truths? Why attempt to deceive the weak and innocent with the idea that the

policy of the Liberal party is to throw open our markets to the world without nations of the world opening up their markets to us? The Liberal party has never committed itself to such a suicidal policy. The policy of the Liberal party is tariff for revenue, reciprocity, equal rights to all, special privileges to none; a policy that must commend itself to the hearts and consciences of all right thinking men.

CHAPTER VI.

I have just clipped from the Toronto World of even date, March 22, 1902, the following article under headlines "Protection Coming:"

"There is no mistaking the strength of public opinion in favor of raising the tariff so as to afford effective protection to Canadian industries. Those who are in favor of protection need not waste their time imploring Sir Wilfrid Laurier to introduce the necessary legislation. We imagine that he perceives the force of public opinion, and that he has arrived at the conclusion that, if he does not accede to the popular demand, he will find himself replaced by a leader who will. One of the certainties of the future seems to be that Canada will have a tariff arranged on the principle prevailing in the United States. The country is not in favor of retaliation with the United States or of the so-called tariff for tariff. What is demanded is a tariff that will give to Canadian workmen the business that rightly belongs to them; that will develop native industries that are now stagnant because of our improvident legislation in favor of foreigners. The important point today in the issue is that the government realizes the force of public opinion, and sees that something must be done. The cabinet is divided, while the country is almost unanimous in favor of protection. The only debatable point is as to the method by which protection shall be secured.

If the government has the nerve to cast aside its free trade theories, and to adopt the protective principle, we may secure protection from it. If, however, Sir Wilfrid cannot shake off his old-time prejudice against the National Policy, and if he refuses to accede to the popular wish, then he and his government will have to go. If the tariff is not put in shape by the present government, protection will be the issue at the next general election. The country will not have to wait long, in any event, for a protective tariff. What Sir Wilfrid will probably try and do is to make a compromise, trying to please both free traders and protectionists. In this, however, we anticipate he will fail. As far as the World is concerned, we prefer to see Sir Wilfrid bow to public opinion, and introduce the necessary legislation, but we are not so much concerned about it as we were some time ago, because we perceive that, within two or three years at the most, Canada will have a tariff that will protect her interests just as effectively as the Dingley tariff protects the interests of the people of the United States."

Now let us look at this article closely and expose its fallacy, a fallacy that will no doubt succeed in deceiving many of the innocent World readers. Public opinion is not in favor of raising the tariff as the World says. The opinions expressed by the Conservative press and the few Conservative members is not to be mistaken for public opinion—these opinions represent a very small proportion of the people of this country which is evidenced by the overwhelming ex-

pressions of public opinion in the last two general elections when Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his trade principles were substantially endorsed. Return to a system similar to that prevailing in the United States! Never! I say public opinion will never re-adopt a tariff that proved so disastrous to Canadian progress during the last ten years of its operation. Public opinion, expressed by the future men of Canada, will never endorse a principle similar to that prevailing in the United States, where greedy, grasping monopolies and trusts oppose and crush the masses of the people, and under whose system strikes, riots, murder and bloodshed are inseparable from their daily records. The young men of Canada will not accept ready made ideas as their forefathers did. The young man of the future will read, learn, think and act for himself; he will see wherein lies the strength and greatness and glory of Great Britain and he will observe the conditions of the people of the United States, and by this observance he will never revert to the principle of protection which the World says is coming. Will the World undertake to show instances where Canadian workmen are today deprived of that business that rightly belongs to them? I ask any public man in what period in the history of Canada were workingmen better paid or when they were more steadily employed than during the past six years. I ask every citizen to look back upon the condition of our country during the last ten years of the National Policy regime, and review the condition of the workingman, the farmer and the merchant during that

time. Any person who has been observant during those ten years has observed that thousands of our workingmen were walking the streets in vain search for employment; that scores and hundreds of able bodied, willing workers were tramping the country roads and begging for work and bread. They have seen our industries closed for weeks and months during those ten years. They have seen hundreds of merchants make assignments; they have seen the depreciation of their properties; worse, far worse, they have experienced its results and know what a return to such conditions mean.

I deny that the cabinet is divided on the question of freer trade and high tariffs. The differences existing—if there be any real differences, is not on the question of freer trade and high tariffs, but a question of how best to continue the administration of those reforms in the speediest manner and with due consideration to the needs of the best interests of the whole people. There are many important considerations in relation to the question of our tariffs. To make a sweeping reform at one stroke would create an uncertainty that would cause a commercial and industrial depression for some time, hence the wisdom of gradual reductions, that will eventually create an equality of all men under a permanent tariff that shall be constituted a means of revenue sufficient to conduct an economical, and a progressive administration.

CHAPTER VII.

The progress enjoyed during the past six years has been phenomenal. It was not thought possible that in six years such a wonderful change would take place. The men who have so wisely guided the course of the state ship during these few years deserve the highest enconiums. The clear, precise and accurate mode that they have observed throughout their whole course, the great attention they have paid to the object for which they were appointed deserves the warmest praise. Their policy has given an impetus to the workingman, the merchant, the farmer and the manufacturer alike. It is not necessary that figures should be published to show the general prosperity that is felt and shared today by the Canadian people. Every man knows it and enjoys it. Every factory, every store and every industry feels it. Every city, town, village and hamlet; every farmer and every mechanic feels it. The banks, railroads, financial and insurance companies show it. The church, the Sabbath school, the public schools—all testify to this prosperity. At no period in her history has the trade and commerce, the industry and progress of Canada made such rapid strides as during the past six years, and while I do not say that Providence has been inseparable from the advantages achieved from natural causes, I say that the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is primarily responsible for the development of trade, the pro-

motion of immigration (which is one of the most effective means by which the burden of taxation upon the people may be lightened, every settler in the west contributing increased revenue towards the general taxation and the consequent prosperity and development of the country); the preferential tariff, (insuring enlarged markets to the farmers of Canada); the adoption of ocean cold storage systems, (which enables the farmer to ship his products in good condition to the markets of England); the building of the Crow's Nest railway, (which is rapidly opening up new territories rich in coal and minerals, and in affording transportation to our vast regions of gold in the Yukon) and the purity of administration. And while the government has demanded the strictest economy where economy was wise and possible, they have abandoned cheap labor and sweat shop methods. Workmen and artisans employed on public works, whether under the direct employ of the department or in the employ of contractors, must be paid the union scale of wages. Did the Conservative administration enforce such regulations in behalf of the workers? No! But the record of scandals identified with their public works and contracts show that the contractors did exceedingly well. Did the Conservative party introduce the Alien Labor Law that was necessary to protect the workmen against cheap pauper labor and degraded labor systems? No! Records of labor unions during the regime of the Conservative party at Ottawa abound with testimony to the contrary. It remained for the Liberal party to introduce effective

legislation that would protect the home market from competition with the labor markets of the world.

It remained for the Liberal party to establish a department of labor, where in disputes between capital and labor the workingmen may take their grievences in confidence and look for an effective settlement.

It remained for the Liberal party to reduce the postage rates and give us Imperial penny postage and to introduce the many reforms necessary to make the postal department modern, efficient and almost self-sustaining, and when it is considered that this has been done without decreasing the salaries of the employees, it demonstrates the qualities of administration which characterize its management.

It remained for the Liberal party to settle that problem which for years baffled the skill of the politicians, the press and clergy, the Manitoba school question. It remained for the Liberal party to check the exodus that was to have been checked by the introduction of the National Policy in 1878. Instead of an exodus we now have a very large and most satisfactory influx. A few lines from the columns of well known publications will enable the reader to better understand the situation. The Toronto Evening News, of March 3rd, 1902, reprints the following article from the columns of the New York Sun:—

"The men of Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Iowa and Nebraska understand the possibilities of the great prairie and forest country of the Northwest, and although it is alien territory they are crossing the boundary by thousands with their farm equipment

and house utensils to possess themselves of land. The spring migration already has reached the total of 10,000. It is estimated that before the twentieth year of the century 2,000,000 Americans will have settled in the Canadian Northwest. The flag that flies over them will be a British flag. If they prosper they will be permanent residents, and when crops are good —and they are good almost every year in the Canadian West—how can these sturdy farmers fail to prosper?"

The Toronto World of April 9th, 1902, says:

"The most pleasing fact in the history of Canada at the present time is the influx of settlers into Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. The optimistic predictions of six months ago are now being realized. Settlers are trekking towards the Northwest in increased numbers daily, and before very long there will be a veritable rush of immigrants. The formation of big land companies and the raising of the price of land from $3 up to $7 and $8 an acre are sufficient indications of the great movement toward Canada that is now under way. The prairies of Canada are practically the only agricultural lands in North America that have not been taken up. The United States has exhausted its resources, and the people of this country are now turning with greedy eyes toward the Dominion of Canada. It looks as if we were about to experience such a rush as characterized the opening up of Oklahoma and the other Indian reservations. In whatever direction we look, Canada is making substantial progress. The next decade will effect a won-

derful change in this country. As much progress will be made during that time as has been made during the preceding 50 years."

The Medicine Hat News (March 20) says:—"The influx of settlers to the Canadian West is simply wonderful. At Medicine Hat we are in a position to size up the great in-coming, especially of Americans, as we see here daily, trainload after trainload of would-be settlers, bringing with them carloads of miscellaneous effects—horses, cattle, implements, household stuffs. The exodus, this time from the States into Canada, shows that the undeveloped riches of Western Canada are becoming known, and Canada is coming into her own. The rush of settlers is unprecedented, and is taxing the railways to the limit to handle the business in connection with other trade. One settler, on his way to Northern Alberta, talking to The News reporter at the depot one day last week, said he had been held for one whole week at Minneapolis along with some others, being unable to get his carload of stuff through. The policy of the Northwest Government and the C. P. R, of shipping grain over the Soo road to Minneapolis and Duluth, and bringing back carloads of settlers on the return trip, is one which is working both ends for Canada."

The New York Tribune says editorally:—

"The Boston Transcript prints a despatch from Minneapolis declaring that at the present rate of emigration from the northwest to central and western Canada two million Americans will be in the Dominion at the end of twenty years. While this would

seem to be an overstatement, there is no doubt that a large number of Americans are crossing the line, attracted partly by the abounding richness of western Canada and partly by the liberal inducements offered to immigrants by the Canadian Government. The Provinces and Territories of Manitoba, Assiniboia, Alberta and British Columbia, not to speak of Saskatchewan, Athabasca and Yukon, could easily support a population of seventy-five million people. The wheat fields of Manitoba and Assiniboia are already famous, and they have as yet hardly began to be cultivated. There are no finer cattle ranges in the world than in Alberta, while there is an apparently inexhaustible supply of minerals and coal in British Columbia and Yukon, Saskatchewan and Athabasca are as yet unorganized, but in spite of their high latitude their agricultural possibilities are known to be very great.

"Including the great districts of Keewatin and Mackenzie, the chief industries of which are hunting and trapping, this great empire of Western Canada has an area of 2,144,796 square miles, with a population, according to the census of 1901, of only 656,464, of whom 436,464 are in Manitoba and British Columbia. For years the Canadian Government has been making every possible effort to induce immigration to western Canada, but thus far with little success, as these figures show. But the tide appears to be turning at last. The well-authenticated reports of the country's fertility and mineral richness are bringing many desirable settlers from Europe, and, what

at first sight seems most curious, Americans have began to pour in, ten thousand settlers having already crossed the line this spring. Previously many Americans went to the region around Edmonton, in Alberta, and they are all prosperous. It is not at all impossible that in a few years, therefore, this portion of Canada will be largely settled by Americans. As to whether they will remain Americans there is a difference of opinion. The thick-and-thin American 'patriot' maintains on a priori grounds that they will. But those who have talked with Americans who have been settled for some time in western Canada declare that, as a rule, they think it better to identify themselves with the country of their adoption. And as Americans like to see immigrants to this country do that, they cannot blame Americans in Canada for doing it. But in any case, the influx of a large number of Americans in Canada is a most important and interesting fact."

What a different picture this presents to that we have seen under the regime of the National Policy! Our former sons who were exiled during its operation returning to enjoy the freedom of the old flag! American citizens, who were long oppressed by the iniquitous tariff system of their country coming into Canada by the tens of thousands to enjoy the freedom guaranteed to all who take up homes under the best system of government ever instituted; a system of government that is fast becoming the envy and admiration of the nations of the world.

What this movement means to Canada we can only

conjecture. This great inpouring of settlers will create an unparalleled demand for the goods these people require, that they, and their children, may be housed, clothed, fed, educated and amused. The situation suggests a problem which merchants, manufacturers and transportation companies must solve within the next few years. Should the present influx continue, and there is every reason to believe that it will, the population of Canada, when the next census is taken, in 1911, will doubtless total 10,000,000 souls.

The people of Canada have every reason to feel proud of the progress they are making; they are to be congratulated on having exercised their discretion in favor of an administration that is gradually introducing the reforms advocated during the days its members occupied the "opposition benches," and we may with confidence look forward to the time when the errors that had intruded themselves into our national politics, previous to 1896, will be swept away.

CHAPTER VIII.

Ever since the present government has been elected the press and leaders of the Conservative party have been engaged in an effort to convince people that the Liberal party of Canada is a disunited party; that there continuously exists a spirit which tends to disrupt the ministry and plunge our industries into disorder and ultimate ruin. Nothing could be more absurd. The spirit of unanimity which exists between the ministers and the members of the Liberal party, and the good will that exists between the progressive people of this country is of the most harmonious and desirable nature. Differences of opinion on some questions affect, more or less, all organizations, but when a great question appeals to the good and wise judgment of the party, that has for its object the upbuilding and advancement of the national prosperity, when movements that have for their object the oppression of the people of the Dominion of Canada, it is seen that the Liberal party is strongly united.

Our ministers have shown their courage and virtuous resolutions of administering the government by means more honorable and more permanent than corruption, and it is confidently believed, that the great masses of the Canadian people will replace their confidences, to an overwhelming degree, in the declarations of the men who have so invariably proven themselves to be their friends.

It is no exaggeration to say that every act introduced by this party has had for its object the prosperity of the Canadian people, which is manifest in all the departments of trade and industry and in the comfortable and independent conditions of the people. In fact, true Liberalism has no other purpose than that there shall be freedom of labor and of all the liberties which pertain thereto. Its first principle consists in the pursuit of the guarantees of liberty. It does not admit that men are bound, when they associate themselves and create a political society, to sacrifice some portion of their individual liberty. Its idea of the social contract is quite different; Liberalism regards it as an association of all in order to assume each has individual liberty. To lay with one hand the power of government on the property of the citizens, and with the other bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprise and build up private fortunes is none the less robbery, because it is done under the forms of law and called taxation. This, Liberalism says is not just legislation, it is but a decree under legislative forms. Liberalism says there can be no lawful tax which is not laid for a public purpose, for the purposes of carrying on the government of the country in all its branches under an efficient and economic system. Any tax that is levied for any other purpose than the raising of revenue for public purposes is not, constitutionally, a tax, and whatever governmental exaction has not this basis, is tyrannical and unlawful. Liberalism is more. It is the consciousness which a freeman has of his right, and

of his duties as well, hence a Liberal is the man who demands liberty, even for his opponents. It means that men shall think, recognize and practice; that all men are free and equal; that judicial authority shall be exercised with equality to high and low, rich and poor; that taxation shall be levied without special interests or privileges tending to the advantages of one over the other—in a word, that all men shall have equal opportunities for enjoying the fruits of their labor.

These are the basic or fundamental principles of Liberalism, and are the principles that have always dominated the Liberal party of Canada. From the time when it was not permitted to a Protestant clergyman to perform the sacred rites of the holy bonds of matrimony in this country until the present day; from the time when it was not permitted to a young man to exercise the duties of citizenship, when only wealth qualified him to be an elector, Liberalism, championed by leaders whose names adorn the pages of our histories, has had for its purpose the freedom and liberty of all classes, and we are indebted to these noble and inspiring leaders for the enjoyment of liberty guaranteed us by the legislation that has, from year to year, been of an advanced and enlightened character. It was for such liberties as this that our grand old sires stood shoulder to shoulder in defence of their rights and we who inherit it at the cost of their hardship and their blood, would indeed be ungrateful were we to turn our backs upon our benefactors—the great Liberal party of Canada. This does

not mean, however, that men should become slaves to the Liberal party, for when the time comes that any leader or set of leaders of this party falter at introducing, defending and enforcing impartial laws; when they falter at exercising the purest administration of all branches of our public service, then it will become, our duty, as Liberals, to replace those leaders by men loyal and true to the traditions and principles of the Liberal party. And if the Liberal party should at any time forget its principles, if it should at any time advocate any wrong, or perpetrate, or tolerate any acts of heinous misgovernment, then it will become the duty of the people—the whole people—to rise and consign them (as they did the Opposition in 1896) to political destruction, rather than that they should bring reproach upon their good name as a party, or upon our common country.

CHAPTER IX.

In an editoral appearing in the Mail-Empire of March 24, 1902, headed, "The Free Trade Outburst," the writer says:—"The great question which this issue raises is whether Canada is to go forward or to go behind. We do not believe this country can progress under free trade." Who is it that is advocating free trade? From where is such an outburst coming? Certainly not from the Liberal party. Certainly not from the Conservative party. Then where? Simply through an attempt by the Opposition to cajole and deceive innocent electors. It has been shown over and over, time and again, that the Liberal party are not committed to free trade. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking at Quebec in 1896, clearly defines this argument, He says:—"We are told by way of reproach that we are going to introduce free trade as they have it in England. I am sorry, for my part, being a freetrader, that we cannot have free trade as they have it in England; but while we cannot have it, we intend to have, and must have a revenue derived from customs duty, but with this difference between the Conservative party: The Conservative party agreed that the main basis of revenue must be derived from a customs tariff, but we disagree on that point. They levy their duties, not to raise revenue, but to favor special interests. Our object will be to raise revenue from customs duties, but to favor the whole Canadian people

by taxing everybody equally; by placing an even burden on all shoulders, making the difference only that those who are wealthy should pay more, and that those who are poorer should pay less and by making raw material, as far as possible, free. We have not to travel from protection to free trade, but from protection to a revenue tariff. This is the aim and purpose that we have in view. Taxation is an evil. But I do not come here as a demogogue to tell you that there must be no taxation. Taxation is an evil and is to be used sparingly, but every civilized man must pay for government. We can deal with protection without causing disturbance of any kind whatever."

There is no resolution on record to show that the Canadian Liberals are committed to free trade. The Mail-Empire knows this, but it clings to the idea tha men, to be Conservatives, must be deceived, her the frequent publication of half-told truths, truths at all. We have then, seen that the grea tion is not a question of protection and free but a question of whether this country shall "go ward or go behind,"

Is it necessary that in order to maintain sup for party candidates, with a view to electing a s cient number of them to give them power at Otta methods must be adopted whereby the cunningness bewilderment of half-told truths will play upon minds of the ignorant and innocent to accompl that end? Is it necessary and is it honorable to p mulgate ideas calculated to serve certain ends at t ense of the man whose lack of education, wh

lack of interest, whose weaknesses make him the victim of a system that deprives him of his natural rights that the few who profit by his innocence and weaknesses should enjoy the fruits of his toil? "The present experience indicates that we must protect both our agriculturalists and workmen," says the Mail and Empire. The present experience does not indicate any such argument. Agriculturists and workmen were never better protected, never enjoyed better conditions than they enjoy under the present system. Agriculturists were never paid better prices for their products and workmen were never so scarce, nor were wages ever so high as they are now. Just one instance in support of my contention, taken from one of today's papers, March 24th, 1902, reporting the advance in milk made by the Toronto Milk Producers Association effect that the advance fixed by this association "is to the prevailing high prices for grain and hired

e also see in the Evening Telegram of April 1st, , that "the local passenger officials for the Grand nk and Canadian Pacific Railway report that the ipts for the months of January, February and rch are forty per cent. heavier than at any other ilar period of time in their history." Are these ications that the agriculturists and workingmen ire to return to the system of depression that preiled during the regime of the policy defended by the ail and Empire?

If the farmers and workingmen were not better otected today than they were under Conserva-

administration, grain products and hired help would not be at a "prevailing high price," and the receipts of the railways would not show such large increases. What reader can recall such conditions during the days of the National Policy? Who could pick up the daily papers during the days of its operation and observe the demand for artisans, mechanics and farm laborers that fill the columns of the daily papers of the present time—that have been characteristic of their advertising columns during the past five years? But why say more in reply to the Mail and Empire article, for on looking over The Toronto World of even date, (April 1st, 1902), we see, under the headlines, "Canada's Eve of Prosperity," that the Mail and Empire is unconsciously answered by a paper of its own political complexion:—"Evidence accumulates on all hands of remarkable business activity throughout the Dominion. There is no indication whatever that the present era of prosperity has reached its climax. On the contrary, everything seems to point to an indefinite continuation of the good times which have been with us for a few years back. The extraordinary demand for houses in Toronto is a reliable measure of the business activity that prevails throughout the country generally.

"It is said there are 1,500 families who are not occupying houses of their own simply because there are no houses for them to occupy. By the time these are supplied there will be 1,500 others wanting houses."

What strong testimony to the prosperity of which

I have spoken, and how prominent it stands in contrast with the reports quoted in the early part of this work, from the same paper.

But that is not all, the World further says—"The C. P. R. will spend millions in improvements, the Canadian Northern will proceed with the extension of its transcontinental line, the country between the C. P. R. and Hudson Bay will be made accessible by railways, and various other railway enterprises in our northern latitudes have been laid out and will be undertaken in the near future. Canada has just made a decent start in the exploitation of her northern areas. Hon. J. H. Ross, Yukon Commissioner, states that there is plenty of room for four transcontinental lines through Canada, and he would not be surprised if the Canadian Northern in time extended a branch to the Yukon. The settlement of Manitoba and the Territories is only one feature of our many-sided interests. We have coal and iron industries in the far east, pulp and paper mills in Northern Ontario and Quebec, nickel mines at Sudbury, a great industrial development at Sault Ste Marie, increasing mining activity in British Columbia, the gold mines of the Yukon, and water powers all over.

"The growth of the Dominion ought to proceed very rapidly in the immediate future, and everything points to this growth being continuous for many years to come. The position of the city of Toronto in this new development is assured. It will be benefited in direct proportion to the development of the country generally. Toronto is financially interested in

not a few of the big projects now under way all over the Dominion, and she must of necessity share in the general prosperity of the country. Mr. Ames, president of the Board of Trade, made a true forecast when he said that Toronto would have a population of half a million before many realized it. The building companies might safely enlarge their operations in Toronto."

Now, how can Conservative newspapers and honest politicians, in face of all these facts, ask the citizens of this country to return to the conditions of 1878 to 1896? Well do they know that such a step would be nothing short of a great national crime.

CHAPTER X.

"But," the young man asks, "if the principle of freer trade be at once so plain and comprehensive, why do these newspapers and politicians of Conservative persuasion cling to, and advocate the high tariff systems?" The reason is obvious. The personal prosperity these manufacturers enjoyed, the immense profits made on their products by reason of high tariffs, and the large sums of money received from the manufacturers by the Conservative organizations during the operation of high tariffs for corrupting the electors to support their policy makes it plain that they should cry aloud for a continuation of it. It is a matter so plain and palpable that any man of ordinary intelligence should be able to see it.

Let us hope then, that the selfish and sordid motives of these advocates be no longer an influence in our national politics, and that the interests of the masses of our people will never again suffer by reason of a system of high tariffs. Let no deception or flattery from the lips of these advocates succeed in ensnaring the sympathy and influences of the youth of our land. Let the records of the past and the experiences of the present be the guide that will direct us in the discharge of our public duties. Let us never falter at the call of duty. The highest patriotism consists in applying true principles to all things, in the education of our youth, and the moulding of pub-

lic opinion, in such a manner that the social and political future of our country may be guaranteed secure.

Let national progress henceforth be Canada's watchword. With her natural resources, waterways, water powers, fisheries, forest, mineral and agricultural wealth, with excited industries running day and night, with increased and increasing comforts for all classes of people, an enviable system of education, freedom of worship, confidence and unanimity, the Canadian people are destined to occupy a proud, happy and foremost position among the people of the earth. This is no idle boast, for with the good sense of the people of this country determined to endorse the perpetuation of Liberal principles in our system of government, we have the absolute guarantee that we will occupy a foremost position among the nations of the world.

With this object before us, I believe the young men of this country will oppose every effort to reinstate a system that attempts to obtain revenue beyond that which is required for reasonable needs of government. I believe the young men of this country will understand the duties required of them in their political relation to the well being of their common country; that they will always be ready to fulfill those duties. I believe the young men of this country realize that they are living, and must act on a broad and conspicuous theatre either for good or for evil to their common country. I believe that the young men of this country will feel that in the common welfare, in the

common prosperity, in the common glory of Canadians they have a stake of value not to be calculated. I believe these young men will act for themselves, for the generations that are to follow them; those who ages hence will bear their names and who will feel in the political and social condition the consequences of the manner in which we have discharged our political duties.

CHAPTER XI.

The Liberal party being a party of reform, and committed to the work of reforming the many errors which had, previous to 1896, crept into our system of government, will not be true to its principles if it does not continue to do all that can be done. The need for reform will never cease so long as this world is peopled by sinners or controlled by sordid motives, so that it rests with the Liberal party of the future, as in the past, to give the people such reforms as the necessities of good, honest, sound principles of government demand. In following up the history of the Liberal party in Canada, one is impressed with the close analogy between the movements it supported (and by which it divided from the Conservative party) of a similar character, although on a larger scale, in the history of British politics. It may be that the interchange of opinions between Canada and the Empire had something to do with maintaining the uniformity of political cleavage on kindred subjects, or it may be that the emigrant to Canada carried with him British politics. At all events it is some source of gratification for the Liberals of Canada to know that the great movements they inaugurated and to which they consecrated all their energies were movements similar in kind and principle to those which received the support of the great Liberal statesmen of England. When a Canadian on the floor of Parliament

or in public declares that no government should make religious opinions a test of citizenship, it might be gratifying to know that such views were entertained by Lord John Russell, John Bright, W, E. Gladstone and all the Liberal lights of the last century. Similarly, when a demand is made for greater freedom of trade, for the extension of the franchise, the protection of the elector at the ballot box, the sovereignity of the people in all matters pertaining to government, purity in the administration of public affairs, the personal integrity of the representatives of the people, these and kindred measures of vast importance to the state have been the watchwords of the Liberal party in Great Britain since the great revolution, and have occupied the thoughts of our ablest and purest statesmen, notably those representing the Liberal party. The historical perspective then of Canadian Liberalism is most satisfactory as well as instructive and would repay fuller investigation.

The Liberal party first asserted itself in Upper Canada by boldly protesting against the tyranny of the "Family Compact" and by demanding (1) the exclusion from office of all appointees of the Government; (2) the entire control of all the revenues of the country; and (3) the responsibility of the executive, i.e., the Government, to the people's representatives in Parliament. One of the earliest champions of these reforms was Wm. Lyon Mackenzie, who as a member of Parliament, and, as a journalist, had ample opportunities of calling public attention to the grievances from which relief was desirable. Although Mr. Mac-

kenzie did not conduct the agitation for the reforms which he demanded, at all times with becoming moderation, yet he drew very distinctly a line of separation between the progressive policy of true Liberalism and the claims of Conservatives of that time by "divine right" to occupy all the public offices and to hold the reins of the Government, with public consent when they could, and without public approval when they dared.

After the Union of 1841, the distinctive character of Liberal principles was represented by Mr. Robert Baldwin, who will always be remembered as the sturdy champion of responsible Government. Mr. Baldwin held that all appointments to office should be made by the Governor-General on the recommendation of his advisers, and that a Government that could not command a majority of the members of Parliament should at once give place to a Government having a majority.

Another question that at a very early period accentuated the difference between the two political parties was the secularization of the Clergy Reserves. The Liberals believed in the complete separation of Church and State. The Conservatives in Canada, like the Conservatives in England, believed in a State Church, and for years the Anglican Church was the only Church in Canada that drew upon the Government for its support. The established Church of Scotland demanded assistance from the state, on the ground that it had legal recognition in Scotland, and was latterly recognized as entitled to state aid. The

secularization of the Clergy Reserves in 1854 was owing to the efforts of the Liberal party, and if the party is only true to its past history, it will never consent to any entangling alliances between Church and State in the interests of any denomination whatsoever. If the Liberalism of Canada teaches one thing more distinctly than another, it is that all men, irrespective of their religious opinions, have equal rights and privileges before the law.

Coming to our own time we still find the Liberal party the champion of liberty. It was the Liberal leaders of 1864 and '67 who championed the cause of Confederation, and although the late Sir John A. Macdonald is called the father of the act and is portrayed as the leading spirit of the body which was delegated to make the constitutional changes incidental to the act, it was Sir John A. Macdonald and his government who opposed the motion for a confederation of the provinces. On the fourteenth day of April in the year 1864 his vote is recorded to the effect that there were no constitutional changes necessary, and that due credit may be given to the real champion of the act, let me say that Sir John A. Macdonald is no more the father of Confederation than James II was the author of the Petition of Right. Sir John dissented from the views held by a majority of the committee to whom the question was referred and declared himself in favor of a legislative union of the provinces. The next day we find his government defeated. It was then that the late Honorable George Brown, at that time leader of the Liberal party, said:

"Gentlemen, you may keep your places in the Government if you like; we have a majority in Parliament; we have defeated you; but we are willing to let you remain in your places if you only give us the constitutional changes that you said yesterday were not needed." It is on record that Sir John and his friends saw the necessity of giving these Constitutional changes, and it is further on record that when Lord Elgin, one of the noblest and best of our governor-generals, took an honorable course in sustaining his constitutional advisers, that the black flag was hoisted at Brockville; that their mob in London pelted him with rotten eggs, and that in Montreal they burned the Parliament buildings. It is further on record that Honorable George Brown told them "not to be afraid," "you will get your places," said he; "we want our principles carried out in the Government and if you are willing to be our tools in this as you have been in everything else in the legislature of the country, we will vote to sustain you in place and power." They did so, and, although Sir John A. Macdonald and his followers, the day before, voted that the changes were not needed, they agreed to carry them out.

But what reform have the Conservative party not opposed? They opposed representation by population, the trial of election petitions by judges, simultaneous polling, the ballot, the Ontario Franchise Act, (thereby excluding the thousands of eligible young men from exercising their franchise in Dominion elections), the County Boundaries, (by introducing the Gerrymander

Act); remedial legislation in the Manitoba School Case; these, and many other reforms, led by the Liberal party, have been opposed by the press, the rank and file of the Conservative party. To stand still, to keep what they have; to allow no innovation, no reform, which had its origin with the early aristocracy of England still seems to be the essence of their political principles.

CHAPTER XII.

Now I think I have been successful in demonstrating to the reader that high tariff is not a productive, but rather a destructive force; that there is such a thing as political economy; that a high tariff system is merely a "legal" means of robbing the poor for the enrichment of the rich. Has the policy of England been of a temporary character? Was it only applicable to conditions when Peel made such great reforms? No! The policy of the Liberal party has been dominant in England for fifty years and under the system of free and freer trade she has become mistress of the waves, the richest and strongest of the nations of the earth. Her policy is a science. Fellow electors, the future of Canada is an important question and you are asked to approach its consideration free from the influences of party passions. You are asked to look upon the two parties as two sets of tools and see for your own satisfaction which set has done the best work. I have carefully endeavored to place before you in plain and simple words the policies of the two parties, the results of their operations, and have also been careful not to allow anything but facts to appear in this work. What I have written has been stated from a purely patriotic motive. I have had no intention to deceive. It is a crime for our writers and politicians to attempt to deceive. No man has a right to believe error, let

alone attempt to spread deception. It is every man's duty to seek and to apply true principles to all things. Acting on false political views your actions effect other people, hence the necessity of acting wisely and well. Young man, the future is before you! Responsibilities great and grave will fall upon you, responsibilities that will be for good or for evil. The element that must win your support must be the traditions and inspirations of the past, the inspirations of the present and the future. If, in the Conservative party you find those elements that inspire, that appeals to the enthusiasm of sound patriotism you will link your destinies with that party. If in the Liberal party you find those elements that inspire, that appeals to the enthusiasm of sound patriotism, then you will link your destinies with the Liberal party. Searching the records of the public men of the Conservative party you will find that while some of them were able statesmen they were compelled by the necessities of their organizations to be constant drags upon the wheels of progress, a hindrance to the moral influences of the whole country. You will find that their policy has always been years behind the sentiments, the needs and aspirations of the people. Contrasting their public declarations with the results of their policy we find the situation one full of discouragement and drawbacks to the inspirations of youth—of the youth, of man and country.

Searching the records of Liberal leaders you find inspiring sentiments from the fact that the greatest heart, the greatest mind, the greatest character, the

greatest achievements were found in the father of modern Liberalism, which has made for him the first and most enduring fame among the statesmen of the world. I refer to the late Right Honorable William Ewart Gladstone. Turning to the history of our own country we read the records of Baldwin, Brown, McKenzie, Blake, Mowat, Hardy, Ross and Laurier. What are the inspirations we receive from their lives? Why, the inspiring sentiments of free soil and free men. These were the defenders and promoters of the liberties we in Canada today enjoy as free citizens of the greatest colony in the British Empire. These are the men who have steered the ship of state through great storms and put her safely into port. Is there a finger that can point to one political crime, to one grave political sin, committed by any of these leaders? Faults they certainly have had, lest we should think them of more than human construction, but it is a glorious tribute to the organizations of the Liberal party that their leaders have always been men of firm, patient, high minded and progressive ideas and ideals, men whose steadfastness of purpose and whose patriotic inspirations have given to them the name of statesmen, whose examples it were honorable for any man to follow, and whose policy appeals to the hearts and consciences of all people. In conclusion, permit me to say that there is no better way of fulfilling our whole duty to ourselves and to our country than to be guided, moved and governed by Liberal motives and principles.

CHAPTER XIII.

No country in the world has, during the past five years, occupied a more prominent position by means of trade development than Canada. Since the present government brought down its tariff bill of 1897, which is equivalent to a reduction of 10½ per cent off the total duties, or taxation, imposed by the Conservative government preceding, Canada's development has indeed been truly remarkable and it is only within the past few months that this marvelous change has been realized by the people.

In seven years the trade of Canada has grown nearly 100 per cent, which is twice the growth that has been attained by any other country in proportion, during that time.

This growth and development is the best answer Canada gives to the impressions created by men like Andrew Carnegie, Esq., who has said that Canada's only hope lies in her becoming a part of the United States, and that our national development has been altogether too slow.

When it is understood that our population barely reaches five millions and a half people, that our annual trade exceeds four million dollars, that we have some two million, four hundred thousand square miles of territory that yet awaits habitation and which will be made more or less productive, these pessimists will perhaps begin to look upon our future

with hopefulness. In fact Canada has made such rapid and substantial progress that she no longer looks abroad for trade favors. The days when Canadian ministers went on their knees for favorable treaties with the Washington government and with the governments of other countries have passed. We find we have all the characteristics and resources of the great nations within our own borders; that we have the brain, the energy, the courage, the ambition, the money and the men, and with these, why should we seek favors abroad? With these national sufficiencies Canadians will henceforth rely upon their own sentiments of loyalty and will in all probability let those nations desirous of trading with us make the approaches. The policy of the present government has made provisions for the development of the various industries and interests, so that it will not be necessary for us to seek treaties. Our statesmen have been careful to make our position secure in this direction, hence there is no reason for alarm at the independent attitude we have assumed. On the contrary it will do much towards keeping our name at the top of the page on the book of fame, and will be the means of better enabling the world's great statesmen to place a value upon the trade and commerce of the Canadian people. While retaliatory legislation is not a Liberal principle there are Liberals who claim that it is the duty of a government to protect its people by prohibiting other countries from unloading its surplus goods upon them. It was this spirit that prompted Colonial Secretary Chamberlain to make the an-

nouncement, in his Birmingham speech, that has attracted such great attention. While it is doubtful if the people of England will submit to a deviation from its present free trade policy, which has brought them from idleness and starvation, there are many free traders who believe that a short experience with a protective tariff would forever settle the agitation, insofar as the great body of consumers are concerned.

That manufacturers, the advocates and defenders of the tariffs and special class interests would profit by the adoption of Mr. Chamberlain's policy we readily concede, but it is doubtful if the real producers of England's wealth, the artisans and agriculturists would benefit thereby. Grant, the latter would receive an increased price for their products by reason of their inability to supply the home demand, will anyone dare say that the increased taxation would not leave them infinitely poorer than they are today? Then how can the colonies of Great Britain honorably entertain trade propositions, the operation of which must prove a burden to that class of people the colonies would object to burden at home? If the colonies are to be loyal, they will not adopt tariffs, or preferences, that will stimulate their growth at the expense of the masses of England. Canada, at least cannot sacrifice her honor and her dignity by entering into such an arrangement, which would prevent her trading with the world and the world from trading with her.

The arrangement of an Imperial trade policy would no doubt stimulate our trade in the direction of the

motherland and the other colonies, but can Canada afford to impose burdens upon her people by entering into an Imperial trade policy, the effect of which will be to increase the tariffs against all other countries, with whom we must trade more or less? Can Canada afford to limit her export trade to British markets? Separated as we are, by great distances, can we afford to put insurmountable barriers in the way of trading on equitable terms with the United States when the Government of that country is prepared to enter into negotiations with us? Would the adoption of an Imperial trade policy enable us to develop as rapidly as we would with freedom to trade with the world? Begone the thought that equitable trade relations with the United States would absorb our loyalty to the motherland! The loyalty of Canadians is not measured by dollars and cents. It is bound by the ties of blood and love which no consideration or temptation can sever. We cannot therefore, see why it is necessary to adopt a trade policy that would be detrimental to the interests of the masses of England, in order to make secure a unity of the colonies with the motherland. Have we not, by the giving of our sons, and of our blood, amply demonstrated our loyalty to the service of our late beloved Queen and our King? I say Canadian loyalty is not to be purchased by the temptations of wealth or treaties; it is the loyalty of a dutiful and obedient son to his parent and that loyalty can no more perish than the Empire itself. Canadians do not forget the history of England and can ill become a party to an agreement that will

reduce the bread earners of that country to the conditions existing there before the reforms of Peel, when her idle and starving masses were actually existing upon grass, and even carrion for food. It would be disloyal for Canadians to accept the policy of ambitious leaders without fully estimating its consequences and when we review our own experiences we can readily understand the injustice that the adoption of Mr. Chamberlain's policy would inflict upon England's people.

That the recent troubles in South Africa have led Mr. Chamberlain to espouse this policy few will deny, but is it likely that a great industrial nation like England will be persuaded to starve itself in peace, for fear of being starved in time of war? Will it not rather call for a policy of free trade, peace and plenty?

There are, no doubt, many men over there, and here, who favor Mr. Chamberlain's policy—patriotic, able men, including members of parliament; but are they not enthusiasts in what they regard as a good cause, and will they succeed in impressing upon the British government, the British parliament and the British people the views they entertain—for it is quite probable that this will be the issue in the approaching British elections. Should the promulgators of this policy succeed, protectionists must not take it for granted that it is a declaration against the principles that have long guided and governed the English people, for I do not believe that any government, where the liberty of its subjects and the freedom of

exchange has occupied a stronghold in the political economy of a nation, will live one term in office. A question of such vast importance however, cannot be disposed of in a day or in a work of this extent, but be the issue what it will, there is no doubt the people will rally to the support of the principles of true Liberalism, which form the brightest pages in British history.

CHAPTER XIV.

We are told by a certain class that with the rapid development of the great Northwest, we have a serious problem before us. These people tell us that the incoming of the farmers and farm laborers from all parts of the world will create sentiments of hostility that will threaten the stability of our systems. That the rapid development of the West promises some strange possibilities is a situation to which our ablest men are not indifferent, but the Canadian people have no fear for the results. Many of these new comers, we admit, are unacquainted with the laws and customs of our people, but where even handed justice and humanity forms so integral a part of national greatness, as it does wherever floats the flag that rules the world, there is no reason to fear any serious result. Many of these new comers speak a foreign tongue, but their children are becoming educated in our schools, in our own language, and as they become educated, so will they become loyal and useful citizens, while their children will have become worthy subjects of the country and its institutions.

How could it be otherwise? Does not the education our systems afford consist in training children to labor with steadiness and skill, and in doing as many useful things as possible, and in the best manner? And with the examples of industry, sobriety and frugality characteristic of the Canadian, how can

these examples fail to become natural to the children of our new comers? Therefore, let us welcome the able bodied sons of the world to our great northwestern lands, and let us not forget that every immigrant placed there represents the transfer of so much fixed capital from the country he left to this, the country of his adoption. But, I am asked, "How is it possible for the government at Ottawa to keep eastern and western Canada together, divided as it is by hundreds of miles of uninhabited country, and with but one great line of railway; is it possible to keep these two sections together? Ridiculous! We have at this moment every hope for the early construction of a second transcontinental line of railway. A third line extending from Port Arthur to Vancouver, is now under construction, while branch lines are being constructed in many directions through this western section. The present uninhabited stretch of country will become settled with the construction of these railway lines and we shall have, in a few years, magnificent cities, towns, villages and agricultural communities where today stands the primeval forest and the lone and mighty rocks and mountains in which dwell mineral riches that no man can compute. It is only within the past five years that a population of 10,000 souls has been placed upon the very lands that were looked upon as valueless, 10,000 souls whose happy, prosperous homes give emphatic denial to the pessimism of the class who today would impede our progress for fear of "changed conditions." Are not our administrators capable of grappling with

these problems, and is capital not always looking for opportunity? Too long, have the views of these pessimists prevailed—but Canada has moved ahead. The ancient clock has struck another hour and on its face are found the words, "we are determined to advance." What this determination means fifty years hence we know not. Perhaps a population of 40,000,000 people, the wealthiest, happiest and freest people in the world! We know of no country on earth possessing the natural resources we enjoy, no country with the timber wealth of Canada, no country with such extensive wheat fields, no country with the mineral wealth. No better water powers are found in the world, no systems more free and yet secure, where the safety of the person is as secure as his property, and where the right to worship as conscience dictates is accorded to every subject.

Too long have we underestimated the great possibilities of our country. It is only within the past few years that our administrators have become awakened to the extent of our resources and to the possibilities of a national development. They knew too little of our agricultural, mineral, forest and manufacturing possibilities. They did not consider the importance of our fisheries, which give employment to thousands of men. They did not see the value of our northwest lands when they gave away to a private corporation, some 25,000,000 acres, which is, at the present time, selling at from $5 to $50 per acre and upon which are settled thousands of happy, contented people. They did not look upon the distance from

the Atlantic to the Pacific as likely to be covered with prosperous homes, where schools and churches would be sustained, here and there thickly settled villages, towns and cities, adding wealth to our country and contributing their equal share of taxation towards the efficient and economical administration of government. They did not consider that we would become competitors with the agricultural and manufactured products of the world, in the halls of learning and of legislatures, but we have accomplished all these things, and more. Our sons have shown their courage and sterling qualities upon the battlefields with the greatest soldiers of the world and have taken second place to none, and while we do not hope for national greatness through the strength of an army and a navy, through the records of bloody battles and the bravery of battle scarred heroes, we cannot but mention these things, for we simply desire to show that in whatsoever Canadians have undertaken, wherever they have gone, they have shown equal capabilities and judgement with the sons of any nation. Every country has a past—has a history. Canada too, has a past and a history—but more than all—she has a future, and to the development of that future let us, as Canadians, stand shoulder to shoulder, determined to make that future secure, full of strength, stability and glory. Let us seek and apply true, manly principles to every phase of discussion that confronts our social and political welfare. Do not let us and our children suffer for want of proper judgment and wise action on our parts. Let us grasp the situation with

courage, determined to play our part in the upbuilding and advancement of our national excellence on lines that will make our posterity as proud of us as we are of such men as Cromwell, Peel, Cobden, Bright, Gladstone, Baldwin, Mackenzie, Mowat, Ross and Laurier. With our destiny in the hands of such leaders of men we have no fear for the future and can safely trust our national development to men with character, ideals and capabilities such as these great men possessed. Every age produces the man if he can but be found. Let Canadians therefore be true to themselves, to one another, and we shall become a great and powerful nation of the happiest people the world has ever known.

PART II.

SPEECHES BY THE LEADERS OF REFORM AND PROGRESS IN CANADIAN POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT.

CANADA'S GREATNESS.

Speech of the Right Honorable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at Quebec, August 1897, on his return from the Jubilee Ceremonies at London:—

"Mr. Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen:—

How can I find words to express to you the sentiments of gratitude which fill my heart at the sight of this immense audience come from all parts of the country to offer me sincere congratulations. How can I find words to tell you what are the feelings which fill my soul as a Canadian and how proud I am of my nationality, of my country, in face of this audience, in face of this panorama which I have under my eyes and which has no rival, I am sure, in any part of the world.

"Gentlemen, if I may believe the terms of the address, the voyage which I have just made in England, in France, in Europe has found some echo in the hearts of my fellow countrymen. Let me tell you without any hesitation that the finest part of that voyage, and perhaps I can say without boasting has had some success, that the finest part of that voyage is the return.

"I loved my country when going away, I love it a hundred times more on my return. I was proud of my country before having seen the countries of Europe, and now that I have seen the most famous of those countries I am a hundred times more proud than I was of Canada, my native country.

I have seen the hills of Scotland, I have seen the fields of England, adorned with woods luxuriant in richness; I have seen the fertile plains of France, covered with grain and vine; I have seen the mountains, the lakes, the villages of Switzerland, famous for their beauty, eternally young, celebrated especially because they were the cradle of liberty in Europe, at the time when liberty was unknown. I have seen Italy, I have seen the plains of Lombardy, those plains which Bonapart showed to his soldiers and which he pointed out to them as the finest in the world; I have seen the hills of Tuscany, with their feet bathed in the azure waters of the Mediterranean, while on their sides the vines and the olives stretched up to the most inaccessible heights.

Gentlemen, we must recognize it, heaven has been prodigal in its gifts to these countries, but let me tell you that however fine they may be, Canada is still finer. I have seen London, with its immense wealth; I have seen Paris with its incomparable artistic beauty, I have seen Rome with all its treasures: well, neither London, nor Paris, nor Rome, not even in Rome, though it be the capital of the religion to which I belong, have spoken to my soul like the rock of Quebec, when I perceived it on my return.

Every country has a history, we also have a history. The volume of our history is not as pageant as theirs, but page for page, it is as well filled, and further, if these countries have a history, if they have the past, we have the future, and it is towards the

future that my soul, that all my faculties are directed, and it was always with my eyes fixed on Canada that each time I spoke in England or in France, I sought, I found my inspiration.

Gentlemen, I am not one of those who make patriotism consist in prolonging old struggles to eternity. I am not of those who believe that Providence united us here, men of every race, to continue the fights of our fathers. I am one of those who believe it is necessary to be inspired by the past in order to find there the source of national unity. I have the pride of my origin. I have proclaimed it a hundred times. I have the pride of my civil status as a British citizen, and particularly have I the pride of the aspirations which I entertain for the future of Canada our common country. I have defended its cause as best I could. I have pleaded its cause with the Imperial authorities. I assuredly do not attribute to myself the victory, but I say that victory crowned our efforts. Our liberty is more complete today on my return, than it was the day of my departure. We did not have commercial liberty as complete as we ought to have it, there were treaties which spoiled our efforts, treaties which prevented us from making the arrangements, and treaties of commerce which we wished. There was the treaty with Germany and the treaty with Belgium, the denunciation of which we asked for years and years. These treaties were useful to England and England hesitated to denounce them, because in denouncing them, in doing away with them, England made a sacrifice of its commercial in-

terests. Well, gentlemen, at the request of our insistence England consented to make that sacrifice and gave up its own interests to preserve those of Canada.

"You have made allusion to the honors conferred upon me by Her Majesty, the Queen of England, and by His Excellency, the President of the French Republic. Those who are acquainted with me know that personally these things however worthy of respect, and they are infinitely so, have no supreme value in my eyes. If I heeded only my democratic sentiments I perhaps would have acted differently from the way I did, but under the circumstances of my life, I have put aside my own personality to consider only what I believe to be my duty towards my country, and if there are a few more letters at the beginning or at the end of my name, be certain that these titles do not add anything to the value of my name as I received it from my father and mother. If there are crosses and decorations on my breast, it is always the same breast which beats beneath them, it is always the heart of a son of the people born among the people, who never so far has forgotten his origin and who never will forget it either.

A GREAT COUNTRY TO GOVERN.

Speech of Hon. Alexander McKenzie at Colborne, July 6, 1877:—

It rests with the Liberal party not merely to initiate such legislation as the party as a whole demands, but it rests with individual members of that party to give their special consideration to such particular views as they may hold; and our real danger is not in advocating, as individuals, measures which the party as a whole have not yet learned to value and respect, but in pursuing our hobbies so far that we detach ourselves from the main body on the march, and so expose our flank to the enemy's fire. Let us as Liberals combine together; let us at such meetings as this discuss the public measures that may be or should be introduced, and the policy that ought to be followed. If we cannot carry all the particular measures we want, let us carry such as we can carry, going on step by step and keeping together.

"But as soon as we open our ranks and divide into sections, the enemy will pour in his fire and accomplish the destruction of our party. I ask any Conservative to name a single measure of reform which that party initiated.

I ask them to name a single great reform which they did not oppose, until they found that the Liberal party were going to carry it over their heads, and then they turned round and voted for such portions

of these measures as they thought they might vote for without harm to themselves. Their real aim and their object is to oppose all reform; to stand still; to keep what they have; to allow no innovation, no reform. They used to consider the word "reform" as synonymous with "license," and regard every new measure as a mischievous innovation; and we used to have to fight our way as Liberals step by step in this new country, where every man has a hold on the soil, until at last they were compelled to give the franchise to almost every man in the community. Such has been their policy: it is their nature and belongs to them; it is the part they have to play in the body politic. They are like an enemy behind a citadel of error and darkness, and when the invading army of Reformers have crossed the trenches and forced a passage to the heart of the citadel, they are amazed to find that the whole garrison have deserted their works and are fighting on the other side.

We have a great country to govern, and we have no doubt great measures to deal with in the near future. We have half a continent in the Far West under our control, to be filled up with industrious people. Few countries have a more magnificent destiny before them than have the people of Canada. We have to vindicate the rights of the people of British origin, owing allegiance to Britain's Queen, and believing our system of responsible government is more democratical, more like true liberty, than the boasted Republicanism of the United States. We have it in our mission to vindicate that system of government;

to carry it over the whole of this continent, and carry with it as we will, as we have in the prairies of the Far West, equal rights and ample justice even to the red aborigines of the country of which we have taken possession.

Let us not falter under these circumstances; let us not waste our whole time in seeing whether Sir John Macdonald is the worst man living, or Alexander Mackenzie the wickedest on the face of the earth; let us devote ourselves to principles; let us defend policies. If our policy is not right, let our Conservative friends announce a clear and definite policy; let them disown their old leaders and disavow their acts; let them adopt some name by which we may know them,, and if their policy is the best, by all means adopt it, and let me and my colleagues go. This country is large enough and its people intelligent enough to furnish men capable of governing the country if both the Government and the Opposition were swept from their places. But if you consider that we have to the best of our power, and with a fair measure of success, carried out a policy which you have already stamped with your approval, all I can say is that we shall continue to devote our earnest and careful attention to the promotion of the interest of the farming community, which is a large and important one in this country, as well as of all the other classes that go to make up our population. We may look forward to such a measure of prosperity as will at once settle up our waste regions, people our older

counties more fully, and give life and energy to our manufactures and all branches of our foreign trade.

To these things we ought to devote ourselves with increasing assiduity, and I have no doubt that we shall be able at once to vindicate our system of government on this continent and to pursue uninterruptedly the career of progress that is before us, showing to the world that our political system is one that insures the perfect and equal prosperity of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects.

THE SOURCES OF WEALTH.

Speech of Sir Richard Cartwright at Colborne, July 6, 1877:—

I don't want to flatter you, or depreciate the good that other classes may do to their country, but I do desire to point out that in this present time and day there are but three great sources of wealth in Canada—our farms, our forests, our fisheries and our ships; and that although others may be and are important in their degree, that at present these are the things from which our wealth mainly comes, and that in regulating the policy of this country we must look first and foremost to see how far any policy will affect the welfare of the men who are actually engaged in adding to the real and substantial wealth of the country.

And although I give full credit to the value of the services which the commercial classes afford, I also deem it my duty, in so far as my poor voice and influence can do so, to call attention to what I believe is just now more or less of an evil throughout Canada, and that is the unfortunate tendency that exists among the most promising of our agricultural population to forsake the honest and respectable pursuit of agriculture for the doubtful and precarious gain which they can extract from overcrowded occupations common in towns and cities, and from ill-paid professional work. I think we should be very much

better off on the whole if we had fewer shopkeepers, fewer physicians, and fewer lawyers, and more farmers and more artisans. These are the men who produce the real wealth of the country, and as an intelligent friend of mine said to me some time ago, "I see they are talking about commercial distress in this country. I can tell you that our real commercial distress is that we have three men trying to do one man's work." I believe this is very near the truth, and that in this respect perhaps the system of education which we now possess, and of which we are justly so proud, is possibly somewhat defective. I would deem it the best result of our educational system if its effect be not to make our young men less but more disposed to honest toil, and so better able to utilize the great wealth which still remains unheeded and undeveloped from one end of our country to the other. Depend on it that for a very long period to come Canada will prosper or decay according as the yeomanry of Canada prosper or decay.

One thing more: it is worth your while to bear in mind how great the perils will be which will most assuredly environ the highest political interests of this country if you turn our legislative halls, as has been the case to some extent in the United States, into organizations employed in carrying on a system of lobbying for the purposes of obtaining legislation designed to make the few rich more rich, but the many poor yet poorer than today. That has not been sufficiently weighed by those who are so earnestly exhorting us to readjust our tariff, and introduce a pro-

tective system under which everybody is to grow rich at everybody else's expense. I repeat, that consequence has not been sufficiently weighed, and had these people done as they should have done—watched the course of events in the neighboring Republic, and seen how much of the corruption—of which these very men are never willing to cease talking as regards American affairs—how much of this depends upon and is directly due to the unfortunate fiscal policy of the United States, I think that lesson alone would have gone far to disabuse the minds of the people of Canada of any hankering that they might have after a protective system. Moreover, if there be any who believe that Sir John Macdonald and Dr. Tupper, were they replaced in power, would be able to carry out their promises, would be able to give the protection of which they talk, let them remember that Sir John has been prudent enough under all circumstances never to commit himself by any possible vote, or by any resolution which could not be contrived to read both ways.

Sir John is a very able man, and Sir John never showed his ability more than in this, that, although he was spurred—I might almost say kicked—on from behind, he never would commit himself in the House of Commons by anything like a thorough advocacy of the so-called protective system. Sir John was far too clever a man to be able even to appear to believe in the doctrines which he was advocating, although he, perhaps, would not appreciate the compliment quite in the spirit in which it is offered.

VALUE OF THE FRANCHISE.

Speech of Hon. Edward Blake, Teeswater, September 24, 1877:—

I am glad to know that the Ontario franchise has lately been much improved. One of my suggestions, in a speech in 1874 which evoked some discussion, has found its way into the statute book. A class of our population, which as I thought was entitled to the franchise by its intelligence and by its real though unrecognized stake in the country, but which by its practical exclusion from the benefits of the income franchise was deprived of its right, has received it under the Farmers' Sons' Franchise Act of last session. The true tests of the franchise to my mind are citizenship and intelligence. I don't think we can uphold the franchise of any of the Provinces as perfect; but the nearer we can approach to the practical adoption of the rule that every good citizen possessing a reasonable share of educated intelligence shall have a vote, the nearer shall we approach to what is my idea at least of the true basis of the franchise. I rejoice that the men of this Province are admitted to the franchise while still young. I have always believed that the exercise of the franchise is in itself a very great educator, and that those who were about in a few years to wield by their votes their country's destinies should be initiated into the discharge of that duty while yet their votes, though

powerful, do not predominate. Being thus called on to take an early and active interest in the politics of the country, they will be the better fitted for the discharge of the duties of citizenship when they in their turn shall form a majority of the electors. I congratulate the young men of Canada upon the right which has been recognized as theirs. I trust and believe that they will use it wisely; that they will use it as true Canadians ought—for the interests of this country in which they were born, in which they expect to live and die, and which holds within its bounds what is most dear to them, whether of substantial or immaterial things.

It soon became apparent that the Election Law did not secure the trial and punishment of offenders against its provisions, and that a long series of penalties on the statute book was but a solemn farce. We have, therefore, passed a law making it the duty of the judge, on finding a prima facie case of breach of the Election Act, to try the supposed offender early and summarily without a jury, and to inflict on the convict imprisonment as well as fine—not fine alone, because, the mere infliction of a fine might be no punishment to a wealthy man, and does not involve the disgrace which attaches even to a short term of imprisonment, I believe that those who have hitherto either recklessly or corruptly broken the law will be afraid to break it now, and that we will find ourselves on the approaching occasion nearer a purer election than before. It became apparent that the law was defective also in that it did not provide suf-

ficient means for the prosecution of enquiries into certain cases where yet corrupt practices probably prevailed, and we have accordingly made provision by that direction which a Parliamentary Commission may issue for a full enquiry into cases in which, by the judge's report or otherwise, it appears that the investigation before him was stopped by the action of the parties, and that there are grounds for believing that further enquiry would be desirable. By these means the breakers of the law will be discovered, and it will be in the power of Parliament, if the corruption shall appear widespread and an example become necessary, to resort even to the extreme and somewhat arbitrary step of delaying or declining to issue a new writ.

You know that I have for some time favored a change in the present system of representation, believing that it involves injustice, inequality, and chance to an extent not creditable to this country, and which would not be endured but that long habit and practice have blinded us to its obvious defects. You are aware that I did not think the subject ripe for Parliamentary Action; and I should not myself have presented it at present to the notice of the House. Some progress has, however, been made in that direction. A Select Committee was struck last session, at the instance of a member whose illness unfortunately prevented the prosecution of the enquiry; but I suppose it will be resumed next session, and I venture to believe that if that enquiry be prosecuted, facts will be disclosed which will tend to the formation of a sounder public opinion on the subject, and

which will at any rate show that the present system is so defective as to require amendment. Another demand of a very different character has been made from very high quarters, namely, that we should alter the law as to undue influence. Now, the basis of our representative institutions is that our elections shall be free. Each of us is called on to surrender his share of control over the common affairs to the majority, upon the ground that this surrender is necessary, for not only can we reach a decision; but also the hypothesis, without which the demand would be quite unjustifiable, that, all having a common interest, and each man speaking freely for himself, the view of the majority is more likely to be sound— is more likely accurately to represent what would be beneficial to the community than the view of the minority. This is the ground-work. Now, that groundwork wholly fails if the vote be not the expression of the voter's own opinion, but the expression of somebody else's opinion different from his. If, instead of its being his opinion, it be the opinion of his employer, his landlord, his creditor, or his minister, why, it is not his vote at all, it is somebody else's, and we have not submitted ourselves to the free voice of our fellow-countrymen, but possibly to the voice of a very small minority, who have determined what the voice of the larger number is to be. Thus the whole basis of our representative institutions would be distroyed if we permitted the opinions of our employers, creditors, landlords, or ministers to be forcibly substituted for our own. For this reason, besides the

penalties which are enacted against the exercise of undue influence, we have declared that the vote of any man so unduly influenced shall be null and void, and that elections carried by such undue influences shall be annulled. I cannot, if a landlord, say to my tenant, "Now, tenant, I shall turn you out at the end of your term if you do not vote for my candidate." Though I may have a legal right to turn him out at the end of the term, yet I cannot give the intimation that I will, on this ground, exercise this right. If I do, the vote is annulled as not free. I cannot, if a creditor, say to my debtor, "I will exact that debt at once if you do not vote as I wish," though I may have a legal right to exact my debt. I cannot, if an employer, say to my employee, "You shall leave my employment at the end of the current term unless you vote with me," though the law may not oblige me to retain him in my service. It has been found necessary in all these cases to prevent the relations to which I have referred from being made the means of unduly influencing the vote, in order that this great cardinal principle of our Constitution—the freedom of each man to vote according to his own opinion—may be preserved intact. True, the landlord, and the creditor, and the employer have each the right to speak and persuade by arguments, and the confidence placed in them may be such that the voter's opinion may be changed; but between the argument, the persuasion, the confidence which may conduce to a change in the mind and opinion of the voter, and that coercion which compels him to vote contrary to his mind on

the threat of some loss or penalty, there is a broad and palpable distinction, and that is the distinction which the law lays down. Now, if there be a form of religion under which the minister is supposed to have the power, by granting or refusing certain rites, or by making certain declarations to affect the state of the voter after death, is it not perfectly obvious that the threat of such results to the voter unless he votes in accordance with the opinion of the minister, might be infinitely more potent than any of the other threats which I have named—the exaction of a debt, the ejection of a tenant, or the discharge of an employee? And would not such a threat be obnoxious to just the same objection?

I am far from implying that politics should not be handled on Christian principles. Whatever difficulties and differences there may be as to Christian dogma, there is, fortunately, very little difference concerning Christian morals. We are, fortunately, all united in this country in the theoretical recognition—however far we may fail in the practical observance—of the great doctrines of Christian morality which are handed down to us in the Gospel; and I believe it is on the basis of those doctrines that the politics of the country shall be carried on. Dim indeed would be our hopes, and dark our expectations for the future, if they did not embrace the coming of that glorious day when those principles shall be truly, fully and practically recognized—if we did not look forward to the fulfillment of the promises that "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the

Lord," and that nation shall not make war against nation, neither shall they learn war any more;" if we did not watch for the time when the human law of self-interest and hate shall be superseded by the Divine law of self-sacrifice and love. But while we hope and strive for the accomplishment of these things, we must not forget the lessons of the Great Teacher and Exemplar, When interrogated upon secular things—when asked as to rendering tribute to Caesar, He said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things which are God's." He laid down the principle, and He left the people—the querists—to make the application. So again when He was called upon to settle a dispute between two brothers about an inheritance, He said: "Man, who made Me a judge or divider over you?" Such was the view He took as to the duty of a minister, as to the work of the pulpit; and while I do not hesitate to say that to all ministers I would freely accord the right as citizens of voting, of expressing their opinions, of arguing and persuading, and influencing if they please, my own opinion is that the pastor of a flock divided on politics will be much more likely to retain the fullest confidence of all the members of that flock, and so to discharge effectually his great task, if he abstains from active interference in those political affairs on which there is and will be great division of opinion among them. But, sir, it has been argued in some quarters that the free exercise of one form of religion amongst us is impaired by this law. That would indeed, if true, be a serious thing. But if it

were true, we would still be bound, in my opinion, to preserve the fundamental principle of the freedom of the elector. No man, any article of whose creed, should make him a slave would be fit to control either his own destiny or that of free men. A slave himself, he would be but a proper instrument to make slaves of others. Such an article of religion would in a word, be inconsistent with free institutions, because it would not permit that liberty of opinion in the individual, which is their very base and corner stone. But we are not confronted with that difficulty. The public and deliberate utterances of high dignitaries in more than one Province of Canada have shown that the assertion is unfounded, and have recognized the right of every elector to vote according to his conscience; and the recent statement—communicated to the public through Lord Denbigh—of the head of that Church, shows that the United Kingdom, where the law as to undue influence is precisely the same as ours, is perhaps the only country in Europe where the professors of that religion are free to practice it. If this be the case in the United Kingdom, it is so here, and it is not true that there is any form of religion, the free and full exercise of which is impaired by the preservation of the great principle to which I have referred. I trust, then, that the ill-advised pretensions which have been set up will be abandoned; but should they be pressed, I take this opportunity of declaring that for myself, whatever be the consequences, I shall stand by the principle which I have laid down—and shall struggle to preserve—so far as my feeble pow-

ers permit—to each one of my fellow-countrymen, whatever his creed, the same full and ample measure of civil freedom which he now enjoys under these laws which enable him and me, though we may be of diverse faiths, to meet here on the same platform, and here to differ or agree according to our own political convictions, and not according to our religious faith or the dictation of any other man, lay or clerical.

CANADA, PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

Speech of Sir Oliver Mowat at the Centennial proceedings, Niagara, on July 16, 1892:

May it please Your Honour, Ladies and Gentlemen:—

I am glad to take part in a patriotic celebration in the old town of Niagara, so rich in historical and patriotic associations. That proclamation issued by Governor Simcoe at Kingston a hundred years ago this day was the first step in the political history of the Province, and was doubtless an event of intense interest, as it was of great importance, to the white population of the Province at that time.

That population was small—10,000 souls only, as some estimate. These early settlers of Ontario were distinguished for industry, courage, and a sense of religion and its duties. Take them all in all, they were a noble ancestry, of whom a country may well feel proud. Whether their loyalty was a mistake and a misfortune as some elsewhere aver, or whether, on the other hand, it is to be rejoiced over, as the people of Canada have generally always felt, there can be no denial that it was at all events a profound sentiment on their part. According to their view, in allowing this sentiment to guide their conduct they were acting on principle and performing duty. They were as fond of the good things of this life as their neighbors were. They were as much attached to their houses and lands, their goods and their chattels, as

others were, and as desirous of success in life for themselves and their children. But when the provinces in which they lived ceased to be British provinces and became parts of a new nation hostile to the old, they forsook all the material advantages and prospects which they had in their old homes, and followed the flag of Britain into the wilds of Canada, preferring the privations and hardships and poverty which might be their lot there rather than to live under the flag of revolution. The material sacrifices which they made at the call of what they believed to be duty and right, as well as just sentiment, constitute a glorious record, and that record has influenced the sentiment and conduct of the Canadian people ever since. Those early settlers had been born British subjects; they loved the British name; British subjects it was their determination under all temptations to remain, and on British soil to live out their lives, whatever the determination should cost them.

In 1812 there came to Canadians and Canadian sentiment a new trial. Great Britain was engaged in a great European war, and a majority of the people of the United States of that day deemed the occasion fitting and opportune for adding Canada to the Union, by force if necessary, or by persuasion if the inhabitants would be persuaded. They offered to Canadians freedom from British domination; but Canadians had no grievance against the fatherland. Such of the United Empire Loyalists who still lived had not changed their minds since they came to Canada. Their sons and the newcomers into the country shared

the old preference for British connection, and all sprang to arms to defend the land of their choice at the peril and in many cases at the loss of their lives. That feature in human nature which prompts men thus to fight for their country, even to the death, is one of the noblest in our psychology. It is a necessary incident of a national spirit. As a Canadian, I feel proud of the display of that spirit which Canadians have made at every stage or their history. I am glad to know that it exists still. I am pleased with the illustrations of it which we have had in our volunteers, God bless them! as well as on the part of our people generally when they have had opportunity.

I am glad to know that Canadians of the present day as a body are not disposed to say to the sturdy, self-sacrificing men who were the first settlers of our Province, that they were blunderers in the sacrifices which they made of property and prospects and material instances generally, and in so many instances, of life also. I am glad to know that Canadians of this day have as a body no inclination to undo the work of those noble founders of our Province. As Canadians we, too, are glad that by reason largely of their fidelity we are British subjects here in Canada, and we live here still on British soil. We are British subjects, and we have at the same time a special love for Canada. We feel a special interest in Canada's welfare. Since the time of the pioneers the constitution of the country has been greatly developed in favor of the residents.

A century ago it was thought best that several

colonies of British North America which remained loyal to the empire should have separate Governments: and at first separate legislatures were established, while the Imperial authorities, with the approval of the colonies, retained in their own hands the executive power and a veto on colonial legislation. But, as the population advanced and as the colonists acquired experience in the limited amount of self-government which the Imperial Act of 1791 secured to them, larger powers and popular control over the executive became necessary or desirable, and were from time to time obtained, until the Confederation Act of 1867, which was passed at the request of the principal North American Provinces, formed them into one great Dominion, under a constitution framed in all respects by their own representatives, the representatives of all political parties.

For half a century now the policy of the fatherland has been not to interfere with our affairs, except to the extent that we ourselves ask; and we have all the self-government that through our representatives we have ever asked, or that the Canadians as a people have hitherto desired. The fatherland has also given to us without money and without price all the Crown lands in British North America outside of the Provinces, as well as the Crown lands in the Provinces, amounting to millions of square miles—the Crown lands outside of the old Provinces having been given to the Dominion as a whole, and the other Crown lands to the several Provinces in which the lands lie. Thus Canada has now an area of 3,610,000

square miles—about equal to the United States, including Alaska, and nearly as large as the whole continent of Europe, the seat of so many great nations. Our own Province alone is larger than the aggregate areas of the New England States and New York and Pennsylvania. Half a million square miles of Canadian territory is well timbered land or prairie land, and is suitable for the growth of wheat—a larger wheat-growing area than there is in the United States or in any other country in the world. Another million square miles of territory is fairly timbered and suitable for grasses and the harder grains. As a wheat-growing country, our own Province equals or excels every State of the neighboring Union, and in Manitoba and the Canadian Northwest the wheat grown is the finest in the world. Canada is also unequalled for raising cattle. Our fisheries, timber and mines are other sources of wealth from which considerable profit is derived now, and untold riches will result in the future. Canada is also unsurpassed in the adaptation of its climate and soil for raising and maintaining a vigorous and active population, and this is the most important consideration of all.

Such is Canada; and this great country, won in the last century by British blood and British treasure, has by Britain been confided to its present population for development and use.

It is pleasant to know that until the last ten years of its history Canada advanced faster in proportion than the States of the American Union as a whole, or than most of the individual States did. As

to the causes of there not having been like progress during the last decade, we Reformers ascribe the falling off to the N. P., or so-called National Policy, and the high taxation. Conservatives argue for other causes; but this is not an occasion for discussing the question between us.

It was in this great and growing country—this Canada, so extensive in territory, so rich in resources and so abounding in advantages for the future development—that most of its present inhabitants were born; and it is the land of adoption to the rest of its population. In view of the relations of it to us all, and in view of the history of the country and of what is now known of its immense possibilities, there have grown up among its people, alongside of the old attachment to the British name and British nation and of the pride felt in British achievements in peace and war, a profound love for Canada also, a pride in Canada and hopes of Canada as one day to become a great British nation; British, whether in a political sense in connection or not with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; British because Britain is the nation of the birth or origin of most of us, and has the profoundest respect and admiration of all; British because Canadians retain more of British institutions and British peculiarities than are possessed in other lands; British because of most of its people being more attached to Britain and more anxious for its well-being than they are with respect to any other of the nations of the world. As a native Canadian I am glad to know that this sentiment is not confined

to natives of the old land who reside here, but is the sentiment of their descendants also. It is not birth which alone is the groundwork of national sentiment. Following the example of our fathers, we who are Canadians by birth lovingly call the old lands "home" as they did; and those old lands are as dear to most of us as they were to our fathers who were born there. But we are Canadians none the less on that account, and we love Canada none the less. In my early days I used to mourn over the little Canadian sentiment which there was then among Canadians, whether by birth or adoption; but a gradual change has been going on in this respect, and Canadianism is now the predominant sentiment among by far the largest proportion of the Canadian people.

The future of this Canada of ours is a matter of great interest. What shall it be? We have no grievance against the mother country making us desire separation from it on that account. What led to the American revolution was a practical grievance inflicted by the then ruling classes. It was chiefly the taxation of the colonies for Imperial purposes by the Imperial Parliament which made the colonies rebel. They rebelled reluctantly, and but for that practical grievance and all that it implied there would at the time have been no rebellion. But, however content loyal Canadians may be with our present political position in the empire, people of all parties, both at home and here, are satisfied that our political relations cannot remain permanently just what they are. As the Dominion grows in population and wealth,

changes are inevitable and must be faced. What are they to be? Some of you hope for some sort of Imperial Federation. Failing that, what then? Shall we give away our great country to the United States as some, I hope not many, are saying just now? Or, when the time comes for some important change, shall we, as the only other alternative, go for the creation of Canada into an independent nation? I believe that the great mass of our people would prefer independence to political union with any other people. And so would I.

As a Canadian, I am not willing that Canada should cease to be. Fellow-Canadians, are you? I am not willing that Canada should commit national suicide. Are you? I am not willing that Canada should be absorbed into the United States. Are you? I am not willing that both our British connection and our hope of Canadian nationality shall be destroyed for ever. Annexation necessarily means all that. It means, too, the abolition of all that is to us preferable in Canadian character and institutions as contrasted with what, in these respects, our neighbors prefer. Annexation means at the same time the transfer from ourselves to Washington of all matters outside of local Provincial affairs. Ontario's will is powerful at Ottawa. No Government has been in power there which had not the support of a majority of Ontario's representatives; and no Dominion Government would stand for a month without that support. If things do not go there as we Reformers should like, it is because Ontario, through its own representatives,

has not so willed. But at Washington the influence of our 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 of people would be nothing, though Ontario's representatives would be unanimous. If we want free trade now we have only to elect representatives favouring it, and free trade we may have. If we want not free trade, but a revenue tariff, we have only to send to Ottawa representatives favouring a revenue tariff, and a revenue tariff we shall have. But in case of annexation to the United States, Canadians might be unanimous for either policy, or for any other policy, and their unanimity would amount to nothing unless a majority of the 65,000,000 of other people should also favor it. By annexation we should thus practically be giving up to our neighbors forever the absolute, uncontrolled and uncontrollable right of dealing throughout all time with our federal affairs as our neighbors might deem for their own interest, whether their interest were ours or not; our interest or our opinion as opposed to theirs would not be of the slightest moment. Even a question of peace or war with the fatherland would be decided by others. The war might be most unjust, as other wars have often been; our children and our money might be taken from us in the prosecution against the nation of our affections of an unjust war, the outcome, perhaps, of hatred or jealousy.

Then, again, if the question of mere material advantage were the only question for us to consider, it is at least doubtful whether the masses of our people would, all things considered, derive any material advantage from the sacrifice of ourselves and our

country to our neighbors. It is easy enough to show that but for the United States tariff there are important articles for which our producers would just now realize larger prices in the United States markets than they realize elsewhere. No one can be sure that this would always be so. Further, it is as certain as anything of the kind can be, and it would be blindness to ignore the fact, that, though the farmers in the United States have no McKinley Act to prevent their having free access to the markets of all their States, yet these farmers as a body do not appear to be in better circumstances than our own farmers are, if they are in as good. Their farms appear to be as extensively and oppressively mortgaged as ours are, if not more extensively and oppressively. In a word, farming in that country at this moment, with all the advantages of a free market in all the States, does not appear to be paying better than farming here, if as well. Nor can I discover that their mechanics and labourers are, on the whole, more comfortable than our own.

So many of our people cannot get employment; but I see from the newspapers that hundreds of thousands in the United States are in the same position. Further, the last Dominion census shows that there are 80,480 persons of United States birth living among us. Many thousand persons of United States birth must thus have found in our population of 5,000,000 attractions for themselves and their families greater for business or other things than in the 63,000,000 of their own country. And these American

residents are not the scum of the American people. Quite the contrary. They are more than equal to the average of their countrymen in their own land. They belong, as a rule, to the most industrious, active, intelligent, law-abiding and church-going class of our population. If a still larger percentage of Canadians have gone to the United States, for their life-work or otherwise, it is to be remembered that a country yet new, but with a population of nearly 63,000,000 must present more openings for Canadians than Canada with a population of but 5,000,000 can have for American citizens; not now to speak of those other causes for the recent Canadian exodus, as to which our two political parties differ. Don't let any of our people who happen to be feeling the pinch of adverse circumstances assume in a hurry that people in other lands are on the whole better off than their own people.

I am told that some of our ambitious young men are attracted by the idea of political union, as opening to them political positions outside of Canada; but they should remember that, on the other hand, political union would increase in perhaps a larger degree the competitors for political positions in Canada. The political positions in the Dominion, which are open to British Canadians only—the Legislative Assemblies, the Dominion House of Commons and Senate, the offices of Dominion Ministers and of Provincial Ministers and of Provincial Lieutenant-Governors, not to speak of many others—ought surely to afford ample field for our young men, whatever their ability.

But it is in the masses of the people that I am most interested. Almost any national or other important movement may be a material benefit to a few, and yet be no material benefit to the many. The late war in the United States between the North and the South did great good in abolishing slavery. The war cost several hundred thousands of lives and many hundreds of millions of dollars. It made millionaires of a few, and it added to the worldly means of a good many others, but it is at least doubtful whether the masses of the Northern people since the close of the war have enjoyed any increase of material advantage from the results of the war, however important those results may be in some other respects. So it is quite probable that a few Canadians would be benefited by that annexation to the United States which they are desirous of bringing about; but whether the masses of the present Canadian population, as distinguished from the few, would have any adequate return for the sacrifice of their allegiance, of their nationality, of their national aspirations, and of the advantages which in various ways they now possess, is quite another question. I do not believe they would.

I speak to you against the annexation of our country to the United States, believing aversion to it to be the feeling of all or almost all whom I am addressing, as it is my own feeling; but I speak without one particle of animosity toward the United States. Some of my most esteemed friends are natives and citizens of that country, and but for the

animosity of their nation toward our fatherland I should hold the whole people in most affectionate brotherhood. Like the people of Ontario, they are English-speaking people. They come from the same mother nations that we do. There is much that is common to us in literature, in laws and in religious faith. They are, in an important sense, our brothers, and I should be glad to promote the freest intercourse with them in every way. But I don't want to belong to them. I don't want to give up my allegiance on their account, or for any advantages they may offer. As a Canadian, I don't want to give up any aspirations for Canadian nationality as the alternative of political connection with the fatherland. I cannot bring myself to forget the hatred which so many of our neighbors cherish towards the nation we love, and to which we are proud to belong. I cannot forget the influence which that hatred exerts in their public affairs. I don't want to belong to a nation in which both its political parties have, for party purposes, to vie with one another in exhibiting this hatred. I don't want to belong to a nation in which a suspicion that a politician has a friendly feeling towards the great nation of the origin of the most of them is enough to ensure his defeat at the polls.

Some good men seem to fear that Confederation is unworkable, because so many bad things, as we Reformers think them, have been done at Ottawa since 1878. But, looking at those facts from our own Reform standpoint, let us recollect that what we regard as the worst acts are parallelled, by what has taken

place in Federal or State Governments and Legislatures to the south of us. We may not look merely at instances there in which, happily, corruption or wrong has been defeated or punished, but must look to the far more numerous instances in which corruption or wrong has triumphed. There would be no advantage to Ontario in jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. My thinking badly of what has been done at Ottawa does not prevent my appreciation of our constitution, nor my aspirations as a Canadian nationalist; and for several reasons from our own Reform standpoint. One reason is, that this Province of Ontario is itself to blame for the existence of the obnoxious Ottawa Government, if obnoxious it is. Our trouble as Reformers has been that, unfortunately as we think—fortunately as some who hear me think—we were not able in 1878, and have not been able since, to convince a majority of the constituencies, (we hope to convince them) that they should return to the Dominion Parliament Reformers and not Conservatives.

Some of my brother Reformers in Ontario think Confederation unworkable for good because of Quebec. I would submit for their consideration that we have no right to assume that to be so until we find Quebec maintaining a party in power after the chief Province of the Dominion has ceased to support it by a majority of its representatives. There is not the slightest reason for supposing that a larger proportion of the people of Quebec are in favor of the "National Policy," or are against unrestricted reciproci-

ty, that the people of Ontario, and these two matters at present are the principal points of legislative difference between Reformers and Conservatives. I am satisfied that there is no danger of Quebec's placing itself in antagonism with an Ontario majority of the members of the House of Commons. The result of the late general local election in Quebec is an instructive fact. Mr. Brown's success in getting the consent of Quebec in 1864 to representation by population in the House of Commons is another fact which ought to relieve the fears which many entertain as to what Quebec may or may not do.

Another thing should be noted by any, whether Reformers or Conservatives, who may be led to look on annexation as the only way of escape from what they think still greater ills. Annexation, if it ever comes, is not going to come soon, is not going to come in time to relieve any of our people from the present depression. Many drawbacks and difficulties would have to be overcome before annexation could become a fact, if it were ever to become a fact. We have failed so far to get a majority for even unrestricted reciprocity, and there would be immensely greater difficulty and delay in getting a majority for annexation. Very many are, like myself, prepared for the one measure who are with all their hearts against the other. There can be no annexation unless and until a decided majority of our people want it, and this will not be unless and until their present loyalty is driven out of both political parties; nor until the people of Quebec, the people of the Maritime Prov-

inces, the people of the new Western Provinces and the people of Ontario are prepared for direct taxation for the support of their local Governments. Unrestricted reciprocity we might have at any time that a majority of our Dominion representatives should go for it on terms to which our neighbors would agree; but for so mighty a transaction as the absolute transfer of half the continent to another nation for all time, much more would be necessary than a bare and perhaps accidental majority of the members of the two Houses; much greater assurance than such an act as that would be demanded, and needed, that the mass of the people really and deliberately desired the transfer; and if that should be ascertained and made beyond question, there would have to be long negotiations for carrying so important a matter into effect. My point here is, that whatever may be said for annexation, if immediately attainable, the agitation for it is no remedy for any class of present sufferers.

If we are not for annexation, our clear policy as Canadians is for the present to cherish British connection whatever else any of us may be looking forward to in our political and national future. Canada is not yet prepared for independence. If, as a people we want it, if anything like the same proportion of our population wanted it as did of the American colonies at the time of the revolution, and if this were made to clearly appear in a constitutional way, the fatherland would, beyond doubt, give its consent. Naturally it would be given for our independence much

more readily than for annexation to another power, even though that other were not an hostile power. Consent to either measure would be given reluctantly and regretfully on the part of probably most British electors, and would probably be given willingly on the part of some. But the Provinces of the Dominion are not sufficiently welded together to form Canada into an independent nation. There is something of a Canadian spirit in every one of the Provinces, and there is reason for the hope that the Canadian spirit will be constantly growing stronger in them all. Meanwhile, our great Northwest is being occupied by immigrants to it from the older Provinces of the Dominion, and by those immigrants from Europe who for whatever reasons, prefer Canada to the United States. But, outside of the constitution, the strongest ties which up to this moment bind the Provinces together are their common British connection, their common history as British colonists, the common status of their people as British subjects, their common allegiance to our noble Queen, who has lived long enough and well enough to obtain the respect and admiration of all the civilized nations of the world. These elements of unity are valuable helps for one day consolidating the Provinces into a nation, but they are not sufficient for this purpose yet. If any of us desire Canada to become in time an independent nation, if any of us are for Canada first, if we prefer our own people to any other people, if we prefer our own institutions to those of other people, if we prefer, as many of us do, the character and the

sentiments and the ways of our own people to those of any other people, if we do not wish that as a political organization our dear Canada should be annihilated, if we do not wish to be ourselves parties to its receiving its death blow as a nation, our proper course is plain, the course of us all, Conservatives and Reformers alike. It is to cherish our own institutions, to foster the affections of our people toward the fatherland, to strengthen their appreciation of the greatness and the glories of the empire, to stimulate their interest in its grand history in the cause of freedom and civilization, and to give now and always to the Dominion and the Provinces the best administration of public affairs that is practicable by our best statesmen and best public men, whoever they may be.

Some point to the McKinley act as a reason why Canadians should transfer their country to the United States, and statesmen and politicians in that country are said to have been advised to adopt a policy of peaceable but vigorous coercion as a sure means of getting over Canadian objections to annexation. A policy of coercion by McKinley Acts and like means would be a policy of insult as well as of injury. Independently of all other considerations, self-respect would forbid our permitting such a policy to be successful. Coercion by such means is as little defensible on any moral grounds as coercion by war and conquest. I hope that the leaders and thinkers of our political parties in the Dominion will find means of neutralizing the evils of any attempted coercion. The evils meanwhile, would not be great as compared

with what was readily borne for conscience sake by our Canadian forefathers and predecessors, and I know that their spirit is not wanting in their sons and successors at the present day.

No, I do not want annexation. I prefer the ills I suffer to the ills annexation would involve. I love my nation, the nation of our fathers, and I shall not willingly join any nation which hates her. I love Canada, and I want to perform my part, whatever it may be, in maintaining its existence as a distinct political or national organization. I believe this to be, on the whole and in the long run, the best thing for Canadians, and the best thing for the whole American continent. I hope that when another century has been added to the age of Canada it may still be Canada, and that its second century shall, like its first, be celebrated by Canadians, unabsorbed, numerous, prosperous, powerful and at peace. For myself I should prefer to die in that hope rather than to die President of the United States.

CANADA'S DESTINY.

Speech of Hon. R. Harcourt, Minister of Education at the Centenary celebration, Toronto, September 17th, 1892:—

We can all join enthusiastically in the celebration ceremonies of today. I say all of us, since, while those who are fortunate enough to be able to claim this Province as their birthplace may have a special reason to rejoice in our celebration, all others who have made this land their home by choice will none the less because of that fact rejoice in its prosperity, and welcome its every sign of progress. Some there are who think that our people are not as patriotic as they should be, and that we should therefore lose no opportunity to instil into the minds of our youth a spirit of earnest, broad and healthy patriotism. Those who thus complain point to our neighbors to the south of us as an illustration of a people who in season and out of season, in their schools and colleges, yes, from their pulpits even, as well as in their press and in their literature generally, unceasingly strive to diffuse a love and a loyalty and attachment to their form of government and all their institutions. In their school books this aim is never lost sight of, and in some degree the patriotism they evoke is both narrow and obtrusive. Only such historical facts are kept prominently in view as will kindle in their youth the fire of patriotism. The record-

ed speeches of their public men from the days of their first President, when they dreamed of a great republic yet to be, until now, while they show sharp differences and reveal the acrimony of warm debate touching the party questions of the hour, tend all one way in this matter of love of country and of home. The spirit of pessimism as to their country's high destiny has never had a lodgment even temporarily in the minds of our cousins across the line. So, too, with their pulpits and their press. No opportunity is lost. The flame of patriotism never flickers. Statesmen, orators, ministers of the Gospel, teachers, editors make love of their country their warmest theme. Although we occasionally notice, as partly the result of this fervid patriotism, a national blindness on their part as regards the rights of other peoples, or, at best, a tardy recognition of such rights, we all commend their loyalty to country. Some one has said that it is by a happy illusion that most men have a tendency to think their own country the best. May we not in this Province indulge in this thought without any illusion? With boldness we can invite comparison with other lands as regards all those elements which make up national prosperity and happiness. An invigorating climate, vast and fertile regions, capable of richly supporting a large population, a country extending from ocean to ocean, and stretching over seventy degrees of longitude, untold wealth of forest and of mine, magnificent lakes and mighty rivers—all these are ours, and as crowning

blessings we enjoy in a singular degree an immunity from all pestilences such as tornadoes, earthquakes and famines, which blight less favored lands. Our humblest citizen has guaranteed to him fullest rights of person and of property. We have liberty without license, a benign religion, with great variety, it is true, as to forms, practice and profession—inculcating, however, in its every form, truth, honesty, sobriety and love of man—everywhere exerting a wide and elevating influence. A good education is easily within the reach of all, and the door to preferment opens on equal terms to the son of the poor and of the rich. Colleges and universities, of which other countries might well be proud, maintain high standards, and open their doors invitingly to all classes and to both sexes. Our great educational facilities, unsurpassed nowhere, must in time contribute in an increasing degree to the material development of the country and the prosperity and happiness of our people. Our newspapers, city and provincial, reaching almost every home, well managed and ably edited, exert a powerful influence and contribute largely to the education of the masses. Our school system recognizing the importance of the mercantile and mechanical pursuits, makes special provision for the mental training of those intending to follow these occupations. We have a School of Agriculture, with a comprehensive and practical course of studies, which has already accomplished much in clearing the way for more profitable and scientific methods of tillage. In a somewhat slow and modest way as yet we have

been developing both art and literature, and not a few Canadian artists and writers have won honor and distinction abroad. This centenary celebration invites us to recall the past, and reminds us that we have been making history, and that our country has grown steadily, safely and rapidly. In some channels and directions more rapid progress can be claimed for other lands, but we must not lose sight of the fact, as clear as any which the page of history teaches, that slow growth and gradual progress are ever the surest, and that northern nations, while slower than others in their historical development, have often in a marked degree assisted in swaying the destinies of the world. We have a history of which we need not be ashamed. One hundred years have come and gone since Governor Simcoe (whose features are preserved in stone, carved on the outer walls of these handsome buildings) founded Upper Canada as a distinct Province. During the winter of 1794-5 he took up his residence near where we now stand, and busied himself in planning for the future of this large and prosperous city, the history of which from that early day until now, with its safe, marked and uninterrupted progress, fills so prominent a chapter in the history of the Province. Decade after decade witnesses advancement and progress in every part of the Province. We find, for example, dotting the wooded shores of some of our northern lakes, inviting, popular pleasure resorts, where in those early days the Huron and the Algonquin tribes fought as only Indians can fight for victory and supremacy. And,

looking backwards from the vantage ground of this our centenary year, we can point to many other transformations equally complete and pleasing. If we cannot in our history point to a glitter of startling occurrences, we can do what is far better—we can show a gradual, steady progress in everything pertaining to the comfort, happiness and prosperity of our people. A Legislature, thoroughly representative of a vigorous, earnest people, has session after session passed laws timely and prudent, safeguarding our rights of life and property. What country can show legislation more advanced or leading up to better results than ours? In what land do we find a people enjoying more fully than we do the rights of self-government, or where is there a people more fitted to be entrusted with that precious right? Our laws have been well administered. Our courts of justice have won the unlimited confidence of the people. May we always have upright and learned judges, men of probity and culture who regard the unsullied ermine as dearly as they hold their lives. We can thus look backward with pride and satisfaction. What can we say as to our future? What of our destiny? Our destiny under a kind Providence will be just what we make it. It rests in our own hands. We may, in the face of all our great advantages, mar it if we will. As it is with individual destiny, so it is with national destiny. We are largely the architects of our own fortunes. We have laid, as I have shown, deep and safe and broad, the foundations for a bright future. Imbued with the healthy sentiment which has pre-

vailed in the motherland for centuries, attached to the forms of government, cherishing her precedents and traditions, we have passed from childhood to youth. We are approaching manhood and its strength and vigor must depend upon ourselves. What is needed, then? We must appease interprovincial jealousies; we must modify mere local patriotism; We must cultivate an increased national feeling, and show in every way we can that we have crossed the line of youth and pupilage. If our public men will be true to themselves, and govern us with wisdom and foresight and high statesmanship, and if our people will be intelligent, honest and vigilant, then we will enjoy a degree of success to which no limit can be fixed.

THE EVILS OF PROTECTION.

Speech of Hon. David Mills at Windsor, October 6th, 1877:—

This, question, gentlemen, of free trade and protection is not a new question. It is a renewal upon our soil of the conflict between the exclusive spirit of a past age, and a more generous spirit of the present. It is the renewal of a conflict between knowledge and ignorance—between science and a short-sighted and selfish empiricism. It was fought in England during the first half of this century, and the prosperity which has attended the adoption of an enlightened and commercial policy there has more than justified all the predictions of its most zealous advocates. In no country in the world has an exclusive fiscal policy had so full and fair a trial, and under such favorable conditions as in the United States. From 1860 until the present time a system of taxation has been pursued there which promises to make everybody rich at nobody's expense. The murders, the acts of incendiarism, the riots, the strikes and the destruction of property which have taken place of late form a conclusive answer to those who say the system has been successful. In that great country, where nature has been so lavish of her gifts to man, where more than half the land within its settled limits still remains unoccupied and unreclaimed—in that country, capable of sustaining an agricultural

population of one hundred millions in affluence, there exists at this moment an amount of misery and suffering, of destitution and want, amongst the poorer classes of the urban population, which well-nigh beggars description, and which can only find a parallel in the worst governed countries in Europe. Six thousand millions of dollars of taxes have been taken by a protective policy from the consuming population of the United States and given to the manufacturers since 1860. This immense sum has been taken from those to whom it rightfully belonged under the authority of an Act of Congress, with the view of making the nation rich and prosperous. Nevertheless, you find at this moment those on whose behalf it was levied and upon whose behalf it was bestowed still confessing their inability to stand without the aid of the Government props—still calling upon the Government for further taxation in order that their business may be prosperous. An illustrated paper some years ago represented Horace Greely offering a boy a jack-knife for a dollar, and saying to him, "this knife is worth 30 cents, but if you will give me a dollar, and other people will do the same for fifty years, then I will be so rich that I can make jack-knives for 30 cents, too." Such establishments are very costly charitable institutions, and they are intended to make the many poor in order that the few may become wealthy.

Many of you have read of the privileges enjoyed by the aristocracy of France before the revolution; but, I ask you, what abuses, what special privileges, of the ancient regime were more outrageous, were more

hostile to every natural sense of justice, than those conferred upon certain classes of industry in the United States? An attempt has been made by legislation to increase their capital, not by legitimate profits upon the products of their labour, but by forced benevolence levied upon the farmers and artisans, by which the wealth of the one is increased and the other diminished.

The protectionists tell you that it is important to keep our young men in Canada, and that it is important also to induce others to immigrate. It is well to observe whether protection has had this effect in a very marked degree elsewhere. The total immigration into the United States, from 1820 to 1870 inclusive, was 7,800,000. Of these, upwards of six millions were ordinary laborers, 900,000 had been tenant or proprietary farmers before coming to America, less than 800,000 were mechanics, and not more than 120,000 of these were engaged in branches of industry that were protected under the tariff of the United States. So that if it were admitted that those 120,000 were brought to the American Republic in consequence of the fiscal policy, that is but one in 70 of the immigrant population. In the year 1870, 387,203 immigrated from Europe to the United States, but of this immense number only 6,960, or but one in 56, were trained to those pursuits which were protected industries under the tariff. It is clear, then, beyond question, that the restrictive policy pursued by the United States has exercised no perceptible influence upon the immigration to that country. Nor

has it exercised any perceptible influence in preventing the population from going abroad. The population leaving the New England States and going into the agricultural States of the West to engage in agricultural pursuits is larger than the population that has left Canada for the same purpose. Our opponents tell you that as a result of restriction you are to have a home market—that the labourer will command higher wages, that the cost of transportation will be dispensed with, and that although something more will have to be paid for what is produced, something more will be received also for what is given in exchange. It may be that men will argue themselves into a belief of a statement of this kind, but an examination of the facts shows how unfounded it is. There never was an imposter who did not in time become the victim of his own imposition.

Men whose immediate interests point in a particular direction and who have neither the time nor the inclination for generalization, may be brought to regard such absurdities as true, but they will not bear one moment's honest scrutiny. Did you ever hear of a manufacturer seeking to discourage the immigration of the class of artisans whom he employs? If you have, that is more than I have done. He asks that the product of labour, and skill, and capital shall not be brought from abroad to compete with him. He asks that the Government shall prefer him to the consumer and compel the consumer to pay him a bounty. He says that if you do this his foreign competitor will leave his own home, bring his labour, skill and capital

into Canada, and that prices will be as low with protection, in consequence of home competition, as they were before without it. Do you think he is governed by any such motive? Do you think he would urge upon the Government the adoption of a restrictive policy if he believed the immediate consequences would be such as thus described? Not he. It is because he does not believe these representations; it is because, if he has studied the subject, he knows that neither labour nor capital is likely to flow from abroad to rival him. He knows that his competitors will be in most cases discontented workmen and small capitalists at home. He has the start of them. He does not fear them, and he hopes to realize a fortune out of the consumers before any serious result can follow the adoption of the policy which he advocates. It is just as necessary in the interest of the community to exclude the foreign mechanic and artisan as to exclude the product of foreign capital and labour. The one effects the price of labour as much as the other effects the price of merchandise. Every skilled labourer from abroad who settles in Canada becomes a competitor with every other engaged in the same pursuits who is already here. The labourer in the cotton factory, in the woollen factory, or in the car-shop—and I may also say in the field—has precisely the same interest in the exclusion from the country of his brother-labourers that the employer has in the exclusion of foreign products. It must, then, be clear to you that better wages and better times for the working population is not the impelling motive of those who are call-

ing for protection; and until Sir John Macdonald and his partisans earnestly set themselves to work, as friends of the working man, to put down immigration to this country, they can hardly be regarded as sincere in the professions they make.

One of the most important things for you, gentlemen, to bear in mind—important because it is frequently lost sight of—is that the system of taxation proposed by our opponents will take from the pockets of the people an enormous sum of money which will never find its way into the public treasury. The whole theory of financial reform in England, from the close of 1818 down to the retirement of Mr. Gladstone from office, has been that a Government should aim to tax the people only to the extent that the money finds its way into the public treasury. Under this policy, what is paid differs but little from what is received, and the waste of taxation is reduced to a minimum. The policy in England, therefore, is to tax only a certain class of imports which are not likely to affect the prices of others that are not taxed; or, if they do, then an excise duty is put upon the home-produced article of a similar kind, so as to give the State the benefit of the increased value given to it by the increased import duty. To make more clear the idea which I wish to convey to you, let me take the case of alcoholic liquors. We put a tax upon those which are imported, the effect of which is that those manufactured at home, such as beer and whiskey, can be sold at an advanced price. If we put no excise duty upon them, this advanced price goes to

the brewer and the distiller. So that, without an excise duty, those who consume whiskey and beer would be paying a tax which would not find its way into the public treasury, and the brewers and distillers would in that case enjoy incidental protection—that is, they would pocket a large sum of money which would not be legitimate profit upon their business, but a necessary incident of a tax imposed by the Government upon an imported article. Now, if the Government put 17½ per cent. upon broadcloth, the importer must add 17½ per cent. to the original price, and the sum is the primary cost of the article to him. This gives to the manufacturer in this country an opportunity of adding 17½ per cent. to the price of the article he produces. The tax on the foreign article goes into the public treasury. The tax on the home article goes into the pockets of the home producer, and even under our present tariff this sum amounts to several millions a year. The system is essentially vicious and unjust. If we are not at present able to put an end to it, I trust we are able to take care that it shall not be further extended. There is one thing I do know, that when the consuming population of this country fully understand this subject, they will make short work of the system; they will see that men who are anxious to acquire fortunes shall learn to rely on their own judgment as to the wisdom of their investment, and on their own industry, economy, and prudence for success.

I shall not detain you further by a discussion of the subject of tariff. It was my purpose to have

spoken upon the acquisition of British Columbia, upon the acquisition of the Northwest Territories, and upon the policy of our predecessors in dealing with the law relating to controverted and simultaneous elections. I shall do this elsewhere in the country. I have said, however, enough to show you that we understand our mission—that we know our duty, and intend to discharge it in the public interest—that we have so far acted in accordance with our honest convictions of right, and have done nothing to give us cause for thinking that the public confidence has been withdrawn. We recognize the fact that this Union has been established to promote the prosperity of its people, and to secure the colonization of the immense territories of the Northwest which we control. We know that without the development here of a national spirit and a national feeling, we can have no future assured. Mr. Wedderburn, in speaking once against the colonization of the country north of the Ohio River, said he hoped every man settling on the continent, not less than the merchant who for a time may reside at Stockholm or St. Petersburg, would look to the British Isles as his home. I say the very opposite of this. I hold that it is the duty of every man who intends making Canada his home to prefer her to every other land, and to do all he can to make her great and prosperous. The man who comes here from the British Isles must leave his country behind him, as well as the man who comes from the continent of Europe and from the neighboring Republic. Each country of the United Kingdom has its distinct

nationality. Canada, if she is ever to have a place or name in the annals of the nations, must have hers also; and it is a duty that every immigrant owes to this country that he shall become Canadian in sentiment and feeling. I do not ask that he shall forget the great deeds and the great men of his native land, it is impossible that the memory of great wrongs successfully resisted, and the great triumphs manfully achieved, can be forgotten. There are great men and great actions upon which the dust of ages never falls. But our period of childhood has gone by, and manhood or imbecility must succeed. It is our duty as a Government to develop the growth of this national sentiment—to throw our people more largely upon their own resources—to give freer play to their habits of self-reliance—to trust to their intelligence, their industry, their virtue, and their courage, the future of Canada.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Speech of Right Honorable Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the Remedial Bill, Manitoba School Question:—

"Sir, in the face of this perilous position, I maintain today, and I submit it to the consideration of gentlemen on both sides, that the Policy of the Opposition, affirmed since many years, reiterated on more than one occasion, is the only policy which can satisfactorily deal with this question—the only policy which can remedy the grievance of the minority, while, at the same time, not violently assaulting the right of the majority and thereby, perhaps, creating a greater wrong. This was the policy, which, for my part, I adopted and developed the very first time the question came before this House, and upon this policy today I stand once more. Sir, I cannot forget at this moment that the policy which I have advocated and maintained all along has not been favorably received in all quarters. Not many weeks ago I was told from high quarters in the church to which I belong that unless I supported the School Bill, which was then being prepared by the Government, and which we have now before us, I would incur the hostility of a great and powerful body. Sir, this is too grave a phase of this question for me to pass it by in silence. I have only this to say: Even though I have threats held over me, coming, as I am told, from high dignitaries in the church to which I belong, no

word of bitterness shall ever pass my lips as against that church. I respect it and I love it. Sir, I am not of that school, which has been long dominant in France and other countries of continental Europe, which refuses ecclesiastics the right of a voice in public affairs. No, I am a Liberal of the English School. I believe in that school, which has all along claimed that it is the privilege of all subjects, whether high or low, whether rich or poor, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, to participate in the administration of public affairs, to discuss, to influence, to persuade, to convince,—but which has always denied even to the highest the right to dictate even to the lowest. I am here representing not Roman Catholics alone but Protestants as well, and I must give an account of my stewardship to all classes. Here am I, a Roman Catholic of French extraction entrusted by the confidence of the men who sit around me with great and important duties under our constitutional system of government. I am here the acknowledged leader of a great party composed of Roman Catholics and Protestants as well, in which Protestants are in the majority, as Protestants must be in the majority in every part of Canada. Am I to be told, I, occupying such a position, that I am to be dictated the course I am to take in this House, by reasons that can appeal to the consciences of my fellow Catholic members, but which do not appeal as well to the consciences of my Protestant Colleagues? No. So long as I have a seat in the House, so long as I occupy the position I do now, whenever it shall become

my duty to take a stand upon any question whatever, that stand I will take not upon grounds of Roman Catholicism, not upon grounds of Protestantism, but upon grounds which can appeal to the consciences of all men, irrespective of their particular faith, upon grounds which can be occupied by all men who love justice, freedom and toleration.

THE BOURASSA MOTION.

Right Honorable Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech in the House of Commons, March 13, 1900:—

Sir, I understand much better now than I did before what is the reason which has impelled my hon. friend to take the position which he has taken. My hon. friend is opposed to the war; he thinks it is unjust. I do not blame him for holding this view. We are a British country and a free country, and every man in it has the right to express his opinion. My hon. friend has the same right to believe that the war is unjust that Mr. John Morley, Mr. Courtney and many other Liberals in England have to hold the same belief.

But if my hon. friend is of opinion that the war is unjust, for my part I am just as fully convinced in my heart and conscience that there never was a juster war on the part of Great Britain than that war. I am fully convinced that there never was a more unjust war on the part of any man than the war that is now being carried on by President Kruger and the people of the Transvaal. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying this.

If the relations between Great Britain and Canada are to be changed, they can only be changed by the will and with the consent of the people. I am not going to say that the will of the people should be ascertained by a plebiscite, for I believe the well

known methods of the constitution are more appropriate.

But the argument of my hon. friend is, that by taking the position we did, we have changed the relations, civil and military, which now exist between Great Britain and Canada. I altogether repudiate that doctrine, and I cannot conceive upon what argument it can be based. I listened carefully to my hon. friend, and I admire him in many ways, but I did not understand the argument on which he based his doctrine that by sending a military contingent to South Africa we have changed the political relations existing between Great Britain and Canada. He went further. He asserted, and still more insinuated than asserted, that in doing what we did, we had been dictated to by Downing Street, that we had been compelled to act by the strong hand of Mr. Chamberlain. He rather insinuated also that in passing the resolution we passed last session, expressing our sympathy with the Uitlanders, we were rather coerced by the will of Mr. Chamberlain. He rather insinuated that the resolution which we then introduced had been framed by an agent of Mr. Chamberlain. Well, Sir, the fact is that nobody saw that resolution except the hon. leader of the Opposition, who received it from me after it had been adopted by council.

No sir, we were not forced by Mr. Chamberlain, or by Downing Street, and I cannot conceive what my hon. friend meant, when he said that the future of this country was not to be pledged by this government. When and where did we pledge the future of

this country? We acted in the full independence of our sovereign power. What we did, we did of our own free will, but I am not to answer for the consequences or for what will take place in the future. My hon. friend says the consequence is that we shall be called upon to take part in other wars. I have only this to answer my hon. friend, that if it should be the will of the people of Canada, at any future period to take part in any war of England, the people of Canada will have to have their way.

But I have no hesitation in saying to my hon. friend that if as a consequence of our action today, the doctrine were to be admitted that Canada should take part in all the wars of Great Britain and contribute to the military expenditure of the Empire, I agree with him that we should revise the condition of things existing between us and Great Britain. If we were to be compelled to take part in all the wars of Great Britain, I have no hesitation in saying that I agree with my hon. friend, that sharing the burden, we should also share the responsibility. Under that condition of things, which does not exist, we should have the right to say to Great Britain: If you want us to help you, call us to your councils; if you want us to take part in wars, let us share not only the burdens, but the responsibilities and duties as well. But there is no occasion to examine this contingency this day.

And did we do anything wrong, after all, and can my hon. friend complain of our action when we simply put it in the power of these young men who

wanted to go and give their lives in order to promote what was to them a sacred cause, to go to the front? Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if ever there was an occasion when we should have no voice of dissent in this House, it is the present occasion.

I greatly admired the speech of my hon. friend, though I am far from sharing his views. But I call upon him to remember that he belongs to a patriotic family, as he said to us today.

I call upon him to remember that the liberties which we enjoy are largely due to his own family. But if we have liberties on one side would he not accept some duties on the other side? Would he not accept some obligations on the other side? Shall the sacrifice be all on one side and none on the other? The obligations all on one side and none on the other?

We were not compelled to do what we did; but if we chose to be generous, to do a little more than we are bound to do, where is the man living who would find fault with us for that action?

THE IDEAL PARLIAMENT.

Speech by Hon. D. C. Fraser at Hamilton, 1896.

The ideal Parliament is a Parliament of the people, where a man feels that the greatest honor that can be conferred on him is the untrammeled trust of a free people who expect it to do its duty honestly; who expect him while there to guard well their trust and see that not a dollar shall be taken from the people of the country save what is necessary for the purposes of the people, and that when it is taken it shall be economically and honestly expended. Now, let us see, judged by these standards, whether we have such a Government and such a Parliament in Canada, just now. Reference has been made to the Parliament we have. Let me distinguish between the Parliament we have and the Parliament we ought to have. I join with Mr. Tarte in saying that next election is to be fought between the people of Canada and a corrupt and imbecile Parliament. For you can plainly see, gentlemen—and there is not a Conservative in Canada who knows what a Parliament should be, but knows that the blush of shame has been brought to the cheeks of the people by the corruption and incompetency of the men in power—that the issue is already made. We learned at school that an English Parliament—and this is an English Parliament—was a conservative body, a selection from the people, combining all that was honorable in public life. What have we seen at Ottawa of late?

Why, we have of late had resignations every day, sometimes two of them. At one time seven Ministers were out; there was an array of opposing forces and a humiliating capitulation. Several returned, but one didn't, because there was a greater in his place. Is that what you send men to Parliament for? Is that a representative body? Why, they have just enough ability to deceive, not to govern. They are devoting themselves to selfish ends, trifling with public interests, and scheming and looking only to what may bring them votes. As to the fiscal policy I wish to speak very plainly in Hamilton. In 1878 some men talked as if they possessed the power of calling from the earth below and the heaven above the means of making Canada a prosperous country. They were to abolish hard times, to keep plenty by taxation, to keep our own people all in the country and to bring back those who had left it; to give good wages and steady work to all who wished it. Any men who think they can do anything for the benefit of the whole people of the country save to give them the greatest possible freedom to make the best use of their capacities and powers are not worthy the name of statesmen. Leave it alone, and then you will have the greatest natural expansion of heart and brain, of progress and power; give to every man that freedom of opportunity which is the birthright of every British subject and you do the citizen the best service. Do not attempt to produce prosperity by legislation against trade. Any Government assuming to do what our Government pretends to do assumes a power only

resting in the Creator. They put up barriers to prevent God's good things coming from one country to another and then ask you to admire their wisdom and thank them for producing plenty. There are thousands of Conservatives today, who, were they to express their views in honest words would tell you that this humbug and sham was palmed off on them as the one thing needed to make this country and its people great and prosperous is just such a sham and humbug as the Liberals warned them it would prove to be.

THE TWO POLICIES.

Speech by Sir Richard Cartwright at Fergus, July 7th, 1877:—

Every man knows that a Government, whether good or bad, must be anxious that the country as a whole should be prosperous and contented; and if we honestly believe it in our power by legislative action to restore prosperity to the homes of Canada, it stands to reason we would be most anxious and desirous to do so at once. But if we are unable to see that the remedies that have been suggested would fairly meet the disease, we may at least claim that you should believe that we are honest in our convictions when we refuse to use those remedies, inasmuch as no persons, as I said, would profit as much as the Government by the cessation of hard times and the return of prosperity. Now, gentlemen, in connection with these hard times very different policies and many different explanations of their origin, and (as might be expected) very widely different remedies, have been proposed by the heads of the two political parties into which Canada is now divided.

It may be well for me to spend a few words reviewing briefly, first, the two policies which are presented by the two political parties; secondly, the explanations which are given of the present distress; and, lastly, the remedies which each side suggests for its cure. There is one policy of which I am myself

the exponent here today, which holds that all taxes are a necessary evil—an evil which every people must endure, but one which no Government is justified in inflicting except for the good of the whole public. There is another policy which holds that the more taxes you lay on a people the richer they become. There is one policy which holds that the tariff should be framed for revenue purposes, and for revenue purposes only, and another which holds that the astute statesman will so frame the tariff as to enrich a few monopolists at the expense of the whole people. There is one policy for the people and one policy for a small fraction of the people, and, as might be expected, you have one set of men who steadfastly deny that it is possible for you to grow rich by ever so persevering a system of taking money out of one pocket and transferring it to another; another set who maintain that Canada is to grow wealthy by doubling every man's wages and by trebling the prices of all that those wages can purchase. There is one policy which may be defined as a policy of truth, of justice, and of common sense, and another which may equally well be defined as an appeal to every false sentiment—to every ignorant prejudice—to every selfish instinct. There is one which may be called a revenue policy, and another which is called—I think miscalled—a protective policy, though I cannot see at all that it protects even those whom it proposes to protect. The first of these is the policy of the present Government, and the latter is the policy of the present Opposition. I might add, only that Dr. Tupper might take

it as a personal matter, that one is the policy of the true physician, and the other is the policy of the quack.

The explanations offered for the present distress, the severity of which I do not at all deny (it is a lamentable fact which we must all admit and deplore), are almost as diverse as the policies which have been enunciated. Now, there are some of us—old-fashioned fossil Tories like myself, for instance—who entertain such absurd, old-fashioned notions as to believe that if a community is unfortunate enough during a period of three or four years to spend a good deal more than they earn, and at the same time, from unforeseen misfortunes, to earn a good deal less than they expected, they will be likely to fall into circumstances of pecuniary distress. Now, the people of Canada during a period of three or four years did, from causes which I need not now enumerate, import something like ten or twelve millions a year more goods than it was judicious for them to buy, and it is equally true that during the same period, from some unforseen misfortunes, the people of Canada earned upon an average some six or seven millions less than they expected to earn. If you add these sums together for a period of four years, you will find that, one way and another (in all probability), for I am now putting the thing in a general way and not pretending to minute accuracy—we spent in those four years about forty or fifty millions more in purchasing goods than we really could afford. Well, unluckily, at the same time our purchasing power was

reduced by about twenty or thirty millions, or, in other words, we were some eighty millions poorer than we expected to be at the expiration of that period; and, at the same time, not only were some of our best customers very badly hurt by the commercial reaction, which extended over almost every civilized country as well as ours, but it is also true that many of our people had transferred themselves from fairly productive pursuits to others which at the best can only be called distributive. Now, my position is this, that this unfortunate distress, which, as I have said, extended over pretty nearly the whole civilized world, was produced by a combination of the causes I have named, and not by any which a Government could control. If this explanation, whose only merit is that it is plain and simple and true, does not satisfy you, there are sundry others to be given more in accordance with the gospel as expounded by Sir John Macdonald and Dr. Tupper, which, so far as I am able to ascertain what they mean—and it is not always an easy task as regards their speeches in the House of Commons or at the meetings of their supporters—is this, that Canada some four or five years ago, in a fit of temporary insanity, parted with her true guides, philosophers and friends, in the persons of these hon. gentlemen, and hence the outpouring of Divine wrath upon her unfortunate people; hence came wars and rumours of wars; hence bad harvests; hence commercial reactions; hence every sort of ill that human flesh is heir to, including, I presume, earthquakes in South America, and tidal waves in the Pacific, all of which,

as you know, have occurred in unwonted abundance since Sir John went out of office. At any rate all these things were subsequent to, and therefore necessarily consequent on that event—at least if Dr. Tupper is to be believed. And, lest there should be any injustice done to Dr. Tupper, I will read from Hansard his explanations of these unfortunate circumstances, as given in the House of Commons last session:—

"We have had a period of seven years of our national existence of unexampled prosperity, and no country in the world presents a more brilliant example of what a country did achieve in such a short period as seven years. This has been followed by three years of adversity. But, sir, we have these two periods, a period of unexampled prosperity, and that which the hon. gentleman rightly characterized a few evenings ago in this Parliament as one of deep distress. Now, sir, we not only have these two periods, but we have them separated by a sharp line of demarcation, and that line marks the change in the Government of this country."

I have only three objections to make to that statement. One is a slightly important one, and that is that it was not true that we had seven years of unexampled prosperity. During the first three years of Sir John's Administration the imports and revenue were almost stationary. Our imports in 1867 were seventy-one millions; in 1868 they were sixty-seven millions, and they had reached only seventy-two millions in 1869. In 1873-4 they had fallen again from

the figure they had reached in 1872-3 by about three millions; in other words, his seven years' unexampled prosperity shrink into three when you come to apply the ruthless test of figures, though I admit that that is a trifling inaccuracy compared with some statements that emanated from the same source.

In the next place, if Dr. Tupper thinks that prosperity is a proof of the goodness or the badness of a Government, I ask him on the first opportunity to explain to an intelligent Ontario audience how it was that the period of 1857 to 1867, when Sir John had almost absolute control, was not a period of unexampled prosperity, but was one marked by deep distress and heavy and prolonged deficits. When he explains this I shall be happy to follow him with a counter refutation of his doctrines.

Leaving Dr. Tupper and Sir John to arrange this little problem at their leisure, I dare say it will not surprise you to find that the remedies we propose are still more widely apart than are our several explanations of its causes. It is not our fault that our remedy, like our explanation, is of a very plain and prosaic character. We do not believe that we can obtain prosperity by acts of Parliament. We believe that the people of Canada have spent a good deal more than they should have spent, and have earned considerably less than they should have earned, and I am sorry to have to tell you that, under the circumstances, very much of this distress is entirely unavoidable, and that there is one way out of it, and only one. The people of Canada can only

grow richer by the exercise of greater frugality and hard work. I know well that this is not a pleasant doctrine, and I have no doubt that I would be better received in certain quarters if I were able to say that all the people had to do was to sit still and be made rich by legislative interference. But I know of no government on earth that can possibly deliver a free country from the consequences of its own follies and misfortunes without the active co-operation of the people themselves. We may deplore the existence of these consequences and try to alleviate them; but the remedy lies in the hands of the people composing the community from one end of the country to the other. Now, I propose to examine in some little detail some of the arguments advanced by the advocates of protection.

I would say, in the first place, that I fully recognize the difference that exists between the two classes which may be said to compose the protectionist body. There are certain protectionists who are moderate and reasonable in their views—who, as far as I understand their position, are hardly protectionists at all in the proper sense of the term, but who very naturally and reasonably feel much aggrieved at the unfortunate policy which the Government of the United States has persevered in for so many years. This is quite a distinct and different thing from the ordinary protection as advocated by the other persons of whom I speak. When I speak of protection generally, I wish it to be understood that I refer to the second and first of these classes—not that I am able entirely to

agree with many of my friends who advocate those particular views of protection, but because there is a wide and sharply-defined line of demarcation between these two classes. I think it is highly desirable that you should give this question the most careful and serious consideration.

What I desire to do is this. I desire, first of all, to show what protection will cost this country; next, the number of people amongst us who may fairly be said to be benefited, even for a short time, by a protective policy; and lastly, to show something of the ultimate moral and political effects that would result from the adoption of a so-called protective system. I lay it down as a maxim that in every free country where free government is properly understood, no Government is justified in imposing any taxes unless it be for the benefit of the whole people. That is a principle for which you have long fought and have successfully carried out, and are doubtless prepared to maintain. If the protectionists can show that the additional taxes they propose to impose are for the benefit of the whole people—are, in other words, just taxes, they will then have made out their case; but the onus must rest on them, or on any man who proposes to impose additional taxes, of showing that these taxes are necessary and just, and in the public interest.

In dealing with this subject, then, I wish to call attention to what protection really and actually would cost the people of this country. I do not mean to say that the manufactures which now exist, and

which in spite of the hard times are in many quarters continuing to flourish amongst us, cost anything like the sum that other manufactures which require a still heavier tariff would be likely to cost. Probably most of our genuinely successful manufactures would be carried on without any tariff at all; and I am very strongly of opinion that if any man in Canada finds himself unable to manufacture an article without receiving a protection of 17½ per cent. or more, that man will prove to the people of Canada a tolerably expensive luxury. It is computed by statisticians in England and the United States, that every hand—man, woman, or child—employed in factories produces on an average very nearly $1,200 worth of manufactured goods per year. Now, 17½ per cent. on that sum amounts to no less than $210 per annum, and therefore it is perfectly clear that in any manufacture started here requiring protection to the extent of 17½ per cent., for every hand so employed the people of Canada in some shape or other pay a tax of $210, and a considerably higher amount if the tariff is increased. It has always appeared to my mind, in the case of new manufactures requiring a tariff additional to our present duty, that they are but a dubious gain to the country; and when people talk, as they are now doing, about readjusting the tariff, I want to put it plainly before you what that readjustment would do for you; how many hands it would employ; and lastly, what it might probably cost. In 1876 we imported in all about ninety-four million dollars worth of goods. Of this

amount, after careful calculation and examination, I am inclined to think—although the best computation must necessarily be but an approximate one—that it would be possible if we imposed a sufficiently heavy protective duty to manufacture something like thirty million dollars worth of goods within the country.

Applying that rule that I have just laid down, it follows that the manufacture of these goods would employ some 25,000 hands—not full-grown men, but factory hands generally. I have to observe that the goods that can be manufactured are goods from which we derive the greater part of our present revenue, and that therefore the first difficulty that would meet you would be that, whereas we get in round numbers about $6,000,000 of Customs duties on goods imported into the country, you would lose that duty, and would have to make it up by direct taxation, which, while pressing heavily on the whole community, will press more severely upon the farming community in particular. That represents a portion, and perhaps not the largest portion, of the loss which would be sustained, inasmuch as all the deputations that waited upon me on the subject, and with whom I had conversation, admitted that, in order to carry out that readjustment on a large scale, the present tariff would have to be at least doubled; in other words although by a certain readjustment some thirty millions of dollars might be added to the production of Canada, and some twenty-five thousand people employed in producing the amount of goods, you would have to pay at the very least twelve millions

of dollars for the luxury of seeing them made in Canada, or at the rate of about $400 or $500 per head year by year for every one of the hands who would be employed.

As for the plea that this would bring population into our country, I may say that the experience and example of the United States shows conclusively that that would not be the effect, but that there would be instead simply a diversion from the ranks of the farming community and of the artisans dependent on them to those of factory hands, and that the productive power of the country would be lessened by what these twenty-five thousand hands would have produced. I don't deny that it is possible by a certain readjustment of the tariff to give employment to a considerable number of additional factory hands, but I distinctly assert that you would not increase the productive power of the country, and besides, in addition to the present heavy weight of indirect taxes, you would have direct taxation in a very onerous form levied upon you, and you would be obliged to pay as much again in order to maintain these manufactures which these gentlemen say can only come into existence under such a tariff as I have described. Now, to take up the next branch of the question. Suppose that we made this gigantic change—suppose we reversed our whole fiscal policy, and compelled the people of Canada to pay $12,000,000 per year for the support of some twenty-five thousand factory employees, what portion of our people might expect to be benefited thereby? As to this question, I have no bet-

ter statistics to give you than those in the census returns of 1871. They are not entirely accurate, but it is reasonable to presume that the various classes of our population have increased in about the same ratio therein disclosed. Those of you who have paid attention to this subject will know that out of the three and a half millions of people residing in Canada in 1871, something like one million were then employed in various more or less renumerative pursuits. They were divided as follows—500,000 were put down as agriculturists, although the number should have been 100,000 more, because among the unclassified list were probably no fewer than 100,000 who were really agricultural laborers. Then came the very large so-called "commercial" class, 75,000; professional men, 39,000; domestic servants, 60,000; and finally what is known as the "industrial class," 213,000.

Now, God forbid that I should say that this Government or any Government should overlook the interests of even the one-fiftieth part of our population, or refuse to see justice done to the smallest class in the community. If they show their claims to be just, I shall be the first to give them that justice to which they are entitled; but Heaven forbid also that for the sake of this one-fiftieth part of the population we should do a rank injustice to the other forty-nine-fiftieths. Now let us consider a little in detail what our friends the manufacturers really ask of us. I have had a good deal to do with manufacturers myself, and am pretty largely concerned in the prosper-

ity of that interest, and I know that there has been very considerable distress among that class.

I am extremely sorry for this, not only in my heart, but in my pocket also; but I cannot help asking these men, "What do you wish us to do?" Do you ask that the Government of Canada should lay it down as a maxim that we are to relieve you from the results of even unavoidable misfortunes, or from your own mistakes? If you lay down that policy, to what are these things to grow? It would simply come to this, that every time there was a commercial crisis, every time the markets were glutted or the farmers had bad harvests, the Government would have to step in and afiord relief. In other words, if the misfortunes of one class of the people were made good at the public cost, the misfortunes of all other classes would have also to be made good. If manufacturers are to be relieved at the public expense from the consequences of mistakes or misfortunes, why should not farmers also be relieved out of the public purse if their harvests are bad? If commercial men are overtaken by a crisis they must also be relieved, and if professional men do not obtain a sufficient number of clients they would have to be maintained at the public expense. Nay, why should not distressed politicians also come in for relief? You laugh, but why not? Where are we to stop in this doctrine of universal protection? There is a third point involved, which has perhaps not been touched upon sufficiently, but it is one which every Canadian should consider well.

You have to consider what will be the consequence of the future protective policy in its moral, social, and political aspect. I said a year ago, when discussing this subject on the floor of Parliament, that there is one reason which weighed with me very much; and I pointed out at that time that although it could be shown that the adoption of a protective system would enrich a few, it would enrich that few only. It would make a few rich men millionaires, while it would make poorer the great bulk of the community.

EARLY STRUGGLES OF REFORMERS.

Speech of Hon. Alex. Mackenzie at Kingston, June 27th, 1877:—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—

I feel somewhat as Paul felt when he was permitted to speak for himself, because I believe, as he believed, that I am at least before an upright judge; and I am quite sure that the words I address to you, and which are addressed generally to the people of Canada, will find a hearty response among a vast majority of the people of this country. I know full well how difficult a task the Premier of this country has to perform.

We have a country vast in extent, vast in its territorial magnitude, vast in respect to its sectional views, and in its diversity of creed and race; and it is a task which any statesman may feel great difficulty in accomplishing, to harmonize all those interests, and bring a genuine feeling of union to bear upon the prosperity of the country which he has to govern. Under the most favorable circumstances any one would feel necessitated to ask occasionally not merely the indulgence but the forbearance of friend and foe alike in a country like this.

But since the day that my colleagues and I assumed the reins of office we have been met with one continuous strain of coarse and systematic abuse, which appears to have reached its culminating point

at the meetings held by the Conservative leaders throughout the country at the present moment. But, sir, I am not very much surprised at that, for I recollect very well the events which were developed in the earlier days of the history of this country.

I was astonished, however, to find that Dr. Tupper, a few evenings ago, in pronouncing the highest eulogiums upon his leader, Sir John Macdonald, called that hon. gentleman the well-known champion of civil and religious liberty. Why, sir, in the presence of many grey-haired men, the hon. gentleman must have appeared as the personification of the tyrant—as the sum and aggregate of civil and ecclesiastical bigotry and sectional domination. Who does not remember when the hon. gentleman was one of those who battled, not for the religious equality that was spoken of but for religious inequality? Who does not remember our early struggles forty years ago, when we strove to wrest the public domain from the hands of one denomination? Who does not recollect when Presbyterian and Methodist clergymen were sent to gaol because they dared to perform the ceremony of marriage? The hon. gentleman, who is now introduced to the public of Canada for the first time as the champion of civil and religious liberty, was one of the defenders of that system; one of those who strove to perpetuate in our country the dominancy of a creed if not of a race. I spent my earliest days in the political agitation incident to these struggles; my first political meetings were held in behalf of that cause which has been ridiculed by one of its princi-

pal opponents as being characterized as its champion.

Well do I remember the struggle we had in those days for our rights, and how at last, in December, 1847, we succeeded in electing that noble man, Robert Baldwin, with a band of Reformers strong enough to place him in a position to become First Minister of the day, and settle once for all the question of religious equality, in spite of the opposition of Sir John and his party. I know that in a young country like this, passing affairs rapidly shape themselves into history, public events fast recede from view, and the vast majority of those whom I now address had no part in the struggle to which I have referred. But I refer to it now merely to say this: That the Reformers of this country will remember—those who were not alive at that time by reading, and those who were alive by having been in the midst of these events —with gratitude that it was the great leaders of the Reform party who first gave perfect civil and religious rights to the people of Canada. It has been asked what is the difference between the parties at the present moment.

We are told by a certain class—certainly not a very numerous or a very influential one—that there is no necessity for party organization in Canada, because all that separated parties in bygone times has been settled; that the questions that then divided us, now divide us no more. That no doubt is true to a certain extent; and it is also true that the men who first settled all these questions are the men who are most likely to administer the Government in accord-

ance with the principles of those great measures which were disposed of by the Reform party under Mr. Baldwin and his successors. And it becomes highly necessary that the party lines which separated the Conservatives and the Liberals in the olden times should continue to exist, although I am far from saying that any political party can be justified in carrying conflicts so far as to injure the prosperity or prospects of the country. Political warfare ought always to be respectable, and I can honestly say on behalf of those whom I lead, and I think I can also claim it for myself, that we have made every effort to make those party conflicts in which we have been engaged as respectable and as moderate as it was possible to do. It is true we may have occasionally to speak pretty strongly of the conduct of our political opponents, but I have yet to learn that it is necessary in party battles to impugn the motives of political opponents, or to question their veracity, or to pour forth a stream of coarse abuse such as has been indulged in by that well-known gentleman, Dr. Tupper, and his associates.

Let me refer for a moment to the position in which these gentlemen left the country. Sir John says that we succeeded to office on his resignation in 1873, and he resigned, he says, because he doubted if he had a sufficient majority to carry on the Government successfully. Sir John simply resigned at the last moment, because he found that if he had gone to a vote he would have been defeated in a House of his own choosing, for many of the men elected under

his own auspices withdrew their confidence, and would have voted him out of office on finding of what he had been guilty. He had not the moral courage to face a vote, and now he proclaims to the country that he was an ill-used man because he was obliged to resign.

I have been very much amused at the way in which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues refer to the events of 1873, and to the circumstances which were proved on oath by their own statements as to the bribing of the electors in the elections of 1872, and the receipt of $360,000 of Sir Hugh Allan's money for the direct purpose of corrupting the electorate of this country. Why, sir, Dr. Tupper coolly talks of this as a misrepresentation, a mere misunderstanding, and Sir John says he was defeated because of the circulation of foul slanders against his fair fame. So that it would seem that we are to be obliged to have another Royal Commission issued in order to show whether the evidence taken on oath by Sir John's own Government was incorrect or not. It seems it was all a mistake to suppose that Sir Hugh Allan contributed money for the purpose of corrupting the electors.

True, Dr. Tupper says in one speech that Sir Hugh Allan gave a handsome subscription to the election fund, and Sir John received it in the same spirit. That is the way in which the affair is spoken of. I do not wish to say a single word disrespectful to Sir Hugh Allan; but I believe if there is a business man in Canada who more than any other understands

his own business, that man is Sir Hugh Allan. He is a prosperous merchant and has done a great deal of good to Canada in organizing his fine steamship line, and I wish him abundant success in that and his other enterprises. But I sincerely venture to hope that he will not mingle in politics—at least I hope that he and Sir John will not mingle in politics together. He is a Scotchman, a shrewd business man, possessing many of the characteristics attributed to his typical fellow-countrymen. You have all heard the old slander which Dr. Johnson first uttered against Scotchmen —that farthings were first coined for the purpose of enabling them to contribute to charitable objects. I don't believe that myself, but I do believe that if there is a Scotchman in Canada who knows the value of the farthing better than another it is Sir Hugh Allan; and I don't think he was likely under the circumstances to give to Sir John and his colleagues a sum nearing $200,000, and to expend on his own hook—to use a somewhat vulgar phrase—$160,000 more, merely to secure the success of the Conservative party, as Dr. Tupper says. That gentleman calls it a handsome subscription, and asks: "Did not Mr. Cameron, Mr. Cook, and other Reformers spend large amounts on their own elections?" Perhaps they did, but they did not spend Sir Hugh Allan's money; they did not receive money from any public contractor who was to get a contract in consequence of having contributed the money. We have Sir Hugh Allan's own sworn evidence, in which he states that he cared nothing for either of the political factions struggling for

the mastery in this country, but he thought that Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier were the men he could deal with, so he courted them assiduously and made a handsome subscription to their election fund. And now we are told that it was all a mistake, and that Sir John Macdonald was ejected from office because of foul slanders. I hear someone in the audience say that that story is worn out. I don't think it is. It will never be worn out while Canada has a history; and it will be a black day for this country if it is ever worn out.

When we assumed office we did so when a black cloud was hanging over the country, one which obscured the fair fame of Canada in sight of every civilized nation, and was watched alike by the people of England and the United States as belonging peculiarly to the people of Canada. It rested with the new Administration to dispel that cloud, and induce the people of the United States and Europe to believe that all the public men of Canada were not tainted with the same sordid and corrupt motives which led to the commission of that great crime.

We had to contend with other difficulties at the time. The hon. gentleman claims for himself, in one of his recent speeches, that while he reigned, peace, prosperity, and loyalty prevailed all over the Dominion. Why, sir, when we came into office we found a rebellion at Red River barely quelled; we were in pursuit of the men whom the unanimous voice of Canada had branded as murderers, and to whom Sir John Macdonald gave $4,000 of the public money to enable

them to escape. Then he attacked Mr. Blake and myself because we offered a reward for their apprehension in the Legislature of Ontario, and said that it was our fault that Riel escaped, and he "only wished to God he could catch him." I don't wonder a very great deal that the people up in the Northwest rose up in insurrection at the treatment they received. What did this "champion of civil and religious liberty" do on this particular occasion?

He sent out Mr. William Macdougall with a ready-made cabinet to take possession, as if they had been the conquerors of the land, without asking the people what their opinions were as to the mode or nature of the authority under which they were to be placed. The people, not very unnaturally, objected to being presented with this ready-made Cabinet, and though Mr. Macdougall got within sight of the land, he was never able to put his foot on it. The measures of the Government at that time, as Mr. Macdougall says in his famous pamphlet, went to show what they could do to punish those who had objected to their course. We were told the other day that Sir John Macdonald had "bent his energies to draw the Northwest Territories."

Mr. Macdougall was a member of Sir John's Government, and he ought to know. He says in his pamphlet:—

"I am disclosing no secret of the council-room when I affirm that in September, 1868, except Mr. Tilley and myself, every member of the Government was either indifferent or hostile to the acquisition of the

Northwest Territory. When they discovered that a ministerial crisis respecting the route of the Intercolonial Railway could not be avoided by an immediate agreement (and immediate action) to secure the transfer of these territories to the Dominion, they were ready to act. On the same day that Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Campbell surrendered the interests of Ontario to Quebec and Mr. Mitchell, and threw eight millions of dollars into the sea, I carried a proposition to send a deputation to England with full power to close negotiations for the purchase of one-third of the American continent as an offset.'

We have Mr. Macdougall's evidence to show that these people were altogether opposed to this act; and we have also his own testimony to the fact that he was sent out there merely to enable the Government to get rid of him. He says: "as to the fact itself—in spite of your disloyal intrigues and the 'parish politics' of your allies in the East; in spite of Jesuitical plots in the Northwest and Ministerial connivance and imbecility at the Capital;" and so on. I give you this evidence to show you that instead of the country being at rest, it was in a state of turmoil, that instead of these men being entitled to be classed as superloyal, they imbrued the country not merely in financial difficulties, but in political difficulties of the gravest possible character; that instead of seeking to open up the Northwest, they opposed it. When we came into office we found these great questions unsettled. We were obliged to maintain a regiment of soldiers in Manitoba to keep the people quiet. In the

east there was a strong feeling of discontent. There were everywhere indications of a war of races and interests. And we had not merely to deal with all those difficult questions, but we had to punish the guilty, and at the same time to do it in such a manner as would show to those who had taken the part of these men in the Northwest that we were not doing it for the purpose of indicating a hostility to either their race or their creed.

You will remember that the ill-usuage sustained by the half-breeds of the Northwest at the organization of the territory created a deep, strong feeling of sympathy among the French Catholics of Lower Canada. They believed that Riel was a victim, and to some extent that was true. But Riel and his friends had to be taught that they had not merely violated the law of the land in taking possession of the government of any portion of the country, but had violated it in unlawfully and feloniously taking the life of one of Her Majesty's subjects.

All these matters had to be dealt with by the incoming Government; and when we consider that along with these difficulties we had to contend with the effects of these men's great political crime, in its bearing on our financial position, immigration, and otherwise to speak to the rest of the world and maintain the fair fame of Canada, I think I can claim that we pursued as moderate a course as it was possible to do, and that our success has been beyond our expectations.

IMPORTANT ASSETS.

Speech of Honorable J. M. Gibson at the Centenary proceedings at Toronto, September 17, 1892:—

We are a happy and contented people. Our agricultural resources, modes and methods are equal to those of any other country today, and the best proof that could be given in substantiation of this you have had in your city for the last two weeks in the shape of the Industrial Exhibition. The educational system of the country has already been alluded to, and possibly may be further referred to by my friend and colleague, the acting Minister of Education. We have reason to be proud of our educational system—and I shall not be charged with boasting in asserting that our system of education, as a whole, will stand favorable comparison with that of any other country. The administration of justice happily gives rise, and has for a long time past given rise, to little or no complaint. The people are satisfied. The integrity of our judges is never impugned. We have a good system of jurisprudence and practice, and what was formerly known as a distinction between law and justice has, under the legislation of the last twenty years, entirely disappeared, and lawyers will soon fail to appreciate any difference between law and equity. Then, Sir, we have the best—I was going to say the best Government in the world—but I will not say that, because some of my friends here think my testimony

is not admissible on that point; but I believe you will all agree with me that we have the best Premier in the world, at all events. The fact that he has enjoyed for a longer unbroken period than any other man power as the head of a Government, with the full confidence of the people, is ample substantiation of the truth of my statement. By way of set-off, perhaps I may say also that we have a most efficient and the best equipped leader of an Opposition anywhere to be found. All, however, will cordially unite in the hope that both Sir Oliver and Mr. Meredith will long be spared to occupy positions of usefulness in this country. While great progress has been achieved in the past, the present seem to be days of accelerated progress. We appear to have accomplished as much in the past twenty-five years as was accomplished during the previous seventy-five years. What shall be the experience of the next century in our country's history? What shall our children's grandchildren have to say when celebrating another centennial anniversary on the 17th of September, 1993, as they look backward and take a view through the intervening years of us as we are and what we are doing? Let us hope, at least, that however mediaeval and unenlightened our present modes and methods may appear to them, they may be justified in according to us, their ancestors, some measure of praise for the honesty and earnestness of purpose with which we are working out the problems of our day, and some trib-

ute of praise and honour for the loyal and patriotic impulses in connection with our aspirations for the future of this country, which we all love so well.

THE PREFERENTIAL TARIFF.

Speech of Hon. Wm. Paterson in House of Commons, March 30, 1900:—

I want to speak in reference to the increased trade of the country. I do not think I would be making an outrageous claim if I should say that a large part of the increased trade is due to actions that have been taken by this Government and Parliament. I think there is no one in this country who, looking abroad and seeing the evidences of prosperity on every hand, will not be ready to admit that times are now more prosperous than they ever were before. These hon. gentlemen ask us sometimes: What have you to do with better times? There have been better times in all the countries under the sun, they will tell us. What have you done in reference to them? Well, Sir, times are better. I will tell you one reason why I think they are better: Trade in order to be prosperous must be confident, and there must be confidence prevailing throughout the country. There must be confidence in our public men; there must be knowledge that the affairs of the country are guided by men in whose charge they may be safely entrusted. If in the country there is a Government divided against itself; if you find in the cabinet men who cannot pull together; if you find one minister charging another with writing anonymous letters to His Excellency accusing him of dishonorable acts; if you find

one member of the Government standing up in the name of seven others and declaring that the man they swore to serve under as Prime Minister was virtually incapable of carrying on with any measure of success the government of the country; if you witness scenes like that, handed down to history through the mighty agency of the press, how could the people have confidence in the country or in such a government. Sir, no matter how anxious a Canadian might feel for the prosperity of his country, he must despair of its future, when he saw the leading men of Canada taking up such an inglorious position in the very halls of the Legislature. These scenes were witnessed here and the people did not forget them; and when these men were dispossessed of power, confidence was restored, and I believe that was one of the great factors in starting that prosperity which ever since has gone on increasing day after day. One of the hon. gentlemen opposite ventured to shout something across the floor as I was speaking, but it seems to me if I were in his place I would keep very quiet, when things of this kind have to be alluded to in order to answer arguments presented from the opposite side of the House. These gentlemen on the other side have asked us: What have you to do with the prosperity of the country, and I answer them: That the turning out of power of men guilty of the acts I have described, and the return to power of the present government was one of the greatest factors in our prosperity. This government, when it came to office, recognized that the surest way to secure prosperity

for the country was not to handicap its commerce any more than the revenues required, and with due regard to existing industries. This government recognized that if you have a largely increased trade you increase the wealth of the people, you enable them to buy and consume more goods—both the goods of your own manufacture and goods imported from other countries. Has not the result of our policy been that an impetus has been given to every department of trade. I point you to increased imports and I point you to the vastly increased volume of trade that is swelling and expanding to an extent calculated to cheer the heart of every Canadian. On the other hand, I point you to the prophesies of gentlemen opposite that our policy meant throwing men out of work on to the streets, and I point you to the fallacy of that prophesy. I state here today, and the manufacturers of this country are ready to confirm it, that never in our history have Canadian factories been so pushed to supply their orders as they have been since the Liberal tariff was introduced in 1897. The people of this country are a people that any country might well be proud of, and all they want is a chance to develop their energies and to manifest their ability and enterprise. What do we want in Canada? We want markets for the products of our people, and we are finding them in large measure in other countries of the world, even for our manufactured goods. Live manufacturers will tell you today: We want people in the country, we want consumers for what we make. Sir, the policy of the Government is to give them

consumers, to populate the country more rapidly than ever in the past, and to put money in the pockets of the people with which to buy goods whether made in Canada or other countries. That is the policy we have endeavored to follow up, and in reference to our domestic commerce, as well as our foreign trade, every one knows that they never attained anything like the volume they have attained at the present time.

I have been dealing with the existing reduction on the products of Great Britain coming into this country, showing the benefit which Great Britain already has; and all I can say is that if this House will sanction the proposition of the hon. Finance Minister, great as has been the reduction of the taxation that the people have saved during the past year there will be the added benefit that they will secure from the further cut which he proposes shall go into effect on the 1st of July next. Now, Sir, I think that is a benefit not only to Great Britain, but to the Canadian people. I do not put our preferential tariff on the ground alone that it is a benefit to Great Britain. It is a benefit to Great Britain, but it is to be remembered that it is also a benefit to ourselves. If there were no other result from it than the reduction of taxation obtained by the people, then, Sir, it would be a carrying out of the pledge that we gave to the people that we would reduce their burden of taxation. While we give that advantage of 25 cents on the dollar to England over every other nation on the earth, and give it gladly, it is also for our benefit,

because the goods we receive from Great Britain come to the consumer at that much lower price. More than that, when Great Britain's competitor sends in similar goods, the consumer gets the benefit of the preferential tariff, while at the same time the revenue gets the advantage of the higher tariff which stands against the foreigner.

But, Sir, I have more than that to say. I am a citizen and an admirer of Great Britain, and while I desire the unity of the empire, there is a bond of trade between us, and the more trade we do with the mother country, the closer will be the ties which will bind us together; and these ties have been wonderfully strengthened by our preferential tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite may talk as long as they please; but what avails their puny mouthings against this preferential tariff as of no avail to Britain, when the English press, the greatest and mightiest press on the face of the earth, is unanimous in declaring that that was a boon granted to Great Britain, and that it did bind the colonies and the mother country more closely together? Do these hon. gentlemen think that they can make the Canadian people believe what they say, that this preferential tariff is a delusion and a snare and a fraud, in face of the fact that Her Majesty's secretary of State for the Colonies sent to this country his thanks, declaring that it did, and would knit together the colonies and the mother country more firmly than ever they have ever been in the past. Why, Sir, the very words of the Colonial Secretary, telegraphed to this country congratulating the Govern-

ment on this tariff, were incorporated in a motion that was moved by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell), and the Tory party in Parliament to a man voted it down; and now they are emphasizing their position somewhat more forcibly and distinctly by the amendment which they have moved. We are glad of it. Now we know that while we stand by the preferential tariff, while we stand by the old land and that which benefits her as well as our own people, we stand opposed by a party who by their acts are now pledged, if they come into power, to repeal the preferential tariff and go back to the old state of things. The people of this country will have to pronounce on that question, and I venture to say that when their verdict is rendered, it will be a verdict such as they have already given in unmistakable terms, as far as we can judge from public utterances which we have listened to, and from private conversations which we have had with the people, that one of the best and wisest policies ever adopted by the Canadian Parliament was to give that preferential treatment in our markets to the products of the mother country.

I have said that the reduced duties are for our own benefit, if they were nothing more, if you left Great Britain out of consideration. But, Sir, this preferential tariff has done more for us, as we believed it would. We believe we have got what these hon. gentlemen say we ought to get, and what they say they are going to get by an Act of the British Parliament, or else they are going to destroy the prefer-

ence which we have given to the English people. We have today, by virtue of our preferential tariff—there is no doubt about it in my mind—a decided preference in the British market. If it is not a legal preference, it is a preference through the good will of the British consuming public themselves, who by this preferential tariff had their hearts drawn out towards Canada as they never had before. Why, Sir, if it were nothing more than an advertisement it is worth all that we paid. Paid? We paid nothing for it, because in reducing the duties, as I say, we were simply reducing our own burdens. But, Sir, we have had a market in Great Britain to an extent such as we never enjoyed before—a market which is going on increasing and what has been the result? Wealth to the great agricultural class of this country, which means wealth and prosperity to every man who dwells in it.

THE FUTURE OF CANADA.

Speech of Hon. Geo. W. Ross, Premier of Ontario, delivered at Whitby, November, 1899:—

Mr. President, Members of the Executive, Ladies and Gentlemen:—

I thank you very sincerely indeed for this very complimentary address. You have estimated my talents and attainments, I fear, far too high. True, I have had a lengthened experience of public life in connection with the House of Commons and with the Legislative Assembly. While I do not think in my judgment I have reached that lofty pinnacle on which through your kindness of heart, you have placed me, I thank you, nevertheless, for the kind words you have spoken of my career. I sincerely trust that you will find the Liberal party continuing to uphold the honor of the country with the same earnestness and zeal under my leadership as it has done under the leadership of my predecessors. I have not an easy task before me. Those whom I follow were such men as the Hon. Edward Blake, Sir Oliver Mowat, and the Hon. A. S. Hardy, men of talent, of great experience and of high character, and to follow in their footsteps is no easy task. Allow me first to express my sincere regret on the retirement of my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Hardy, who for twenty-six years was a conspicuous figure in the Legislative Assembly of his native Province. Mr. Hardy was pre-eminently

a Canadian, with a strong strain of United Empire Loyalist blood in his veins—a very good strain, as we all know, by which to make Canadian blood, if possible, more thoroughly British. Mr. Hardy gave the full vigor of his manhood to the service of his country, and as the administrator at different periods of three important portfolios, established beyond cavil his capacity as an administrator and as a legislator. For sixteen years I had the honor of being associated with him in the Government, and I can truthfully say that for resourcefulness, regard for the public interests, and integrity as an officer of State, he deserves to rank with the best men ever called to serve Her Majesty as one of her executive councillors. The failure of his health is not a loss to the party simply, but a great public loss, a loss to Ontario, a loss to Canada. To hold him in grateful remembrance as a large-hearted and progressive public servant should be the duty not only of every Liberal in the Province but of every Canadian who appreciates loyalty and fidelity in the discharge of public duties.

On the retirement of Mr. Hardy and by right of his advice I was called by His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, to form a new Government. To be called to the leadership of the Liberal party of a great Province like Ontario is no ordinary distinction, and yet when I reflect on the high standing and pre-eminent abilities of my predecessors you will not charge me with using terms of self-abasement when I say that I would readily have allowed the honor to pass by were it not for the assurances of my colleagues in

the Government and in the House that the call was one which commanded their heartiest approval. And now, having formed a Government, as required by the constitution of the Province, I may say without any undue feelings of exultation that the wider public opinion, which I was unable to consult at the time, has, with a unanimity and cordiality far beyond my expectations, justified my more immediate advisers in the support so kindly proffered at the outset. More than this, I have reason to believe that many who consider themselves comparatively free from the acknowledged obligations of party ties look upon my accession to the leadership with considerable favor.

You have already been informed through the public press of the composition of the new Government. I say new Government, because in a business sense, with one exception, every portfolio has been changed. You have a new Attorney-General, a new Commissioner of Crown Lands, a new Commissioner of Public Works, a new Provincial Secretary, a new Treasurer, a new Minister of Education and a new leader of the Government. The only man whose portfolio was not changed was the Minister of Agriculture. His long experience in that deparment, his eminent fitness as a practical farmer and his administrative ability have pointed him out as the best available man for that position, and we have taken him accordingly. I thank you today for the very cordial nomination of Mr. Dryden as the candidate in South Ontario, and I believe he will be elected.

As to the personnel of the new Government, very

little may be said. They are all, or nearly all, trained legislators and eminently successful in their various spheres of life. The Hon. Mr. Gibson brings to his position legal attainments that command the respect of the whole profession. The ability with which he administered the two departments of the public service which he previously held is a guarantee of success in his new position. The Minister of Education, the Hon. Mr. Harcourt, as a teacher, inspector and a graduate of our Provincial university, as well as by experience as a Parliamentarian, cannot fail to be acceptable to our teaching profession and the public generally. The Commissioner of Crown Lands, the Hon. Mr. Davis, has shown in the successful management of his own business and as Provincial Secretary that he is a man of judgment and capacity.

With regard to the Ministers who hold a portfolio for a first time, a word or two will suffice. Hon. Mr. Stratton, the new Provincial Secretary, has held a seat in Parliament since 1886, and has taken an active part in discussions in the House and in committee work. As a business man he has been most successful and will undoubtedly prove an able and honest administrator. The other new Minister, the Hon. Mr. Latchford, to whom I have assigned the portfolio of Public Works, though new to Parliamentary life, has for some years been regarded as fitted for the distinction just conferred upon him. Of Irish extraction, Canadian born, educated at Ottawa University, able to speak French or English with facility, a trained lawyer and a man of high character, no one who

knows him will doubt his fitness for his new position. My only regret in calling him to the Government was that it involved the retirement of Mr. Harty from the active duties of a department which he filled to the complete satisfaction of his colleagues and of Parliament, and from which under no circumstances would he be permitted to retire did his health warrant his continuance in office. That his ripe judgment and business aptitude might not be entirely lost to us, I have asked him to retain his seat in the Cabinet, and I am glad to be able to say that he has assented to this request.

As to myself, one of the greatest regrets I have in assuming the leadership of the party is that it necessitated my severance, directly at least, from the educational work, from which I have taken so much pleasure, and in which, in one form or another, I had been engaged from my early experience as a teacher in a log schoolhouse down to the day I was called upon to form a Government. If I did not repay the log schoolhouse, while Minister of Education, for what it did for me, I hope to square the account before my leadership comes to a close.

From this preliminary statement you have an idea of how a Government is formed, and what a simple matter it is when constitutional usages are strictly followed to transfer the Government of the country from one leader to another, and to rearrange the whole Cabinet. There was a time in the history of Canada—thanks to the Liberal party that it is now almost ancient history—when such changes could not

have been accomplished without the most perilous agitation.

I think we should address ourselves and apply our surplus means to the development of the country—first to the development of New Ontario, and secondly to the development of old Ontario. For instance, if we can afford it, why not give Mr. Dryden more money for the educational work that is carried on by means of Farmers' Institutes, county fairs, dairy schools and agricultural colleges. Little Belgium, much smaller than Ontario, has several agricultural colleges, Belgium, Denmark, and all the central divisions of Europe know that their existence depends practically upon instruction in agriculture and in the education of the artisan classes. If our finances warrant it, why not increase our grants to these institutions, and why not increase our grants to the public and high schools, and our grants for the improvement of roads, and so on? We live in a progressive period. No true Liberal, no true Canadian, will now stand idle with folded hands, neglecting to pay attention to the development of this country; and I propose that the Government, so far as our means will allow, shall apply their energies, so long as they may have the confidence of the people, to the development of the Province.

Why do I say that? Ontario is today the first Province of the Dominion. It has more weight in the councils of the Dominion than any other Province because of its population and its wealth. Do you want Ontario to shrink into a minor position in the

councils of the Dominion, or do you want it to hold its present status? All my colleagues are natives of this Province, or nearly all. We are all of the opinion that if the Dominion is to prosper, then Ontario should prosper all the more, and be the first Province, and lead the other Provinces for all time to come in wealth, political influence and educational activity. That is the position we propose to take. Now, looking at the map of Ontario, what do you find? You find that Ontario contains 140,000,000 acres, or in round numbers 200,000 square miles. Of that area only 23,000,000 acres, or 45,000 square miles are occupied. In other words, only one-sixth of the area of the Province today is actually in the hands of individual owners, leaving practically five-sixths in the hands of the Crown. Only 12,000,000 of the 140,000,000 acres of land in Ontario are under cultivation today. Actually, we have scarcely touched the fringe of the great agricultural wealth which this Province possesses. I think it is our duty to see that these latent resources are made available for settlement, are placed within the reach of our sons and daughters, and developed. Some years ago we found that our young men were going to the United States. There are today a million Canadians in the adjoining Republic. Of these the greater number were natives on Ontario. Today we are sending our sons to the Northwest and to British Columbia, but to that I do not so much object, so long as they remain under the flag. But do we, the people of Ontario, not owe it to ourselves that we make reasonable provis-

ion for the settlement of our sons within our own Province, and thus reap the benefit which is brought about by its development?

We want to feel more and more the growing responsibilities upon us—shall I say the growing responsibilities upon the Dominion of Canada, of which Ontario is the most important part? W. T. Stead says in his character sketch of Cecil Rhodes that some men think in parishes, some men think in nations, and some men think in continents. I want the people of Ontario to think as a part of the British Empire, as an integral part of the great empire, whose flag we all recognize, and of whose Queen we are loyal subjects. Let me say that one of the most pleasant features of my administration as Minister of Education is this fact: that I believe I was able to instil into the half million of school children of the Province a greater love for Ontario, for Canada and for the empire than they previously entertained. That was done in two ways. When I came in as Minister the history of Canada was not studied in our public schools, except in a desultory way. I made instruction in Canadian history compulsory. The history we had was purely a history of the Province. I organized a committee and placed myself in communication with the Superintendents of Education in all the Provinces, whereby we get a history of the Dominion not only in the schools of Ontario but in those of every Province from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I do not want the people of my native Province to be parochial.

We must rise to a conception of the magnitude of

our position as Canadians. Canada as owner of half a continent is destined to have a future, the brilliancy of which and the success of which no one can anticipate. Why, at the beginning of this century the population of the United States was only 5,000,000. Scarcely a hundred years have flown away, and today their population is estimated at 75,000,000. In 20, 30 or 40 years what will the population of Canada be? It will be just what our energy in developing the latent resources of the country, in encouraging settlement and in improving the social condition of the people will make it. And shall we in the Province of Ontario lag behind and be unfaithful to our duty in this great competition? I would that all Canadians would realize the great possibilities that lie before them. Another thing I did in the same line as that already indicated was to establish Empire Day, so that on the day preceding Her Majesty's birthday nearly one million children assemble in the schools of Canada—not of Ontario, mind you—and give attention to the history of Canada and to her relations with the British Empire. We have not, shall I say, enough confidence in ourselves. We have not confidence enough in ourselves as Canadians. We are looking to the United States, to the Washingtons, Websters and Lincolns and seeking in these names the elements of greatness, forgetting that on Canadian soil we have their equals in the Browns, Baldwins, Blakes and Mowats of the present day. Let us display our loyalty to our own men. Let the children of Canada know that Canadian soil will produce men

equal to any other soil. We think of the great expanse of the United States, forgetting that we have a still greater expanse. We talk of the constitutional development of England, forgetting that we have made even greater development constitutionally than England. There is no land more free, there are no institutions more stable, no people more intelligent than ours. No premier of any country can properly indulge in greater feelings of pride than I can indulge in, in being the first Minister of this great Province.

If there is any one feeling in my heart stronger than another it is that I—a native Canadian, educated in her schools, trained in her institutions, having the confidence of a constituency for twenty-seven years, and now apparently having the confidence of the whole Province—shall devote all my energies, not simply to the development of the country, but to the moral improvement of the people. "Righteousness exalteth a nation." Tennyson says that the limit of a man's greatness is the limit of his moral perception. You cannot make a people nobler in character or purpose than they are in heart or conviction. Let us strengthen the moral foundations of this country, let us purify elections, where they are impure—not elections only, but let us do what we can to purify the whole atmosphere of the country. The way to do this is not by making farcical pretensions as to our virtues, but by living noble, manly lives, as Canadians, and showing to the world and those who come into contact with us that we have convictions founded on the principles of morality. The result will be

to secure for Ontario its pre-eminence as the home of an intelligent, well-educated people. The Government will, without any pretensions, without any blowing of trumpets or any exhibition of virtues, go to work as straightforward, honest men, develop the country on the lines I have indicated, and we trust to show to the younger men that we are not unworthy of their confidence.

STABILITY OF TARIFFS.

From Speech of Hon. W. S. Fielding, House of Commons, March 23, 1900:—

The policy of this Government in tariff matters has been from the beginning a policy of moderation, a policy of prudence and of caution. There are those who said that we were under obligation to make sweeping changes, but these were not our friends. The policy of the Liberal party, as laid down in the great convention in the city of Ottawa, in 1893, was that we should initiate a policy of tariff reform which would have due regard to all existing conditions, without doing injustice to any interest. We have adopted that policy, and carried it out in the letter and the spirit. Step by step, desirable changes have been made. In the step we take we are satisfied that we shall create no disturbing influence and injure no industry in Canada, but shall meet the reasonable expectations of the people of Canada for a further measure of tariff reform. I desire to point out that with an overflowing treasury, the people have the right to expect a reduction of taxation. We propose to give them a reduction, and to give it to them on lines which will create the least disturbance and encourage to a larger extent our trade with the motherland. If we take the largest classes of goods imported from England, and the highest rate of duty,

say 35 per cent. and apply to that the reduction I now propose of 33 1-3 per cent, or one-third of the total duties, the 35 per cent. is brought down to 23 1-3 per cent.

I submit that as things are today in Canada that is a fair revenue tariff, and I do not think that the advocates of tariff reduction would ask us to go, on that class of articles, below the rates we have now named; and inasmuch as tariff stability is very desirable, and inasmuch as confidence in business is the secret, to a large extent, of prosperity, I want to say to all concerned, that I regard that rate of 23 1-3 per cent. as a reasonable tariff, with which, I think, the country will be satisfied, and I do not anticipate a reduction on that class of articles for a reasonable time in the future.

There is a subject to which I wish to make a brief allusion, and it is one not wholly unconnected with that which I have been discussing. There are vast sums of money in England in the hands of the trustees, who have to invest it in the best classes of security. Unfortunately for Canada, we have never been able to obtain the admission of our securities into that trustee list, and the consequence has been that whenever we placed a loan on the market, although trustees might have been willing to invest the vast sums in their hands in Canadian securities, they could not do so, because the English law did not allow it. The desirability of admission to the trustee list has long been recognized. For the last fifteen years, the matter has been agitated by the Government of Cana-

da. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), when he filled the important position of High Commissioner, gave a great deal of attention to the subject, and I know from my inquiry at the time and from information I have since obtained, that my hon. friend laboured hard to accomplish that great boon for Canada, the admission of our securities to the trustee list. But, my hon. friend failed, as all others had. Many things, however, which were impossible for Canada a few years ago, have become possible under the better conditions that have arisen. A year ago, realizing as fully as my hon. friend did the desirability of obtaining admission to the trustee list, I went into the subject very carefully, and prepared a full report upon it, urging, as no doubt, my hon. friend did, in his day, that Canada ought to have her securities recognized as among the best on the English market. Negotiations were carried on for some time through the intervention of our present High Commissioner, who has laboured hard, and has done great service to Canada in that, as in every other respect. I have now the satisfaction of announcing that the difficulties have been overcome, and that by arrangement between Her Majesty's Government and the Canadian Government, legislation will be introduced into the Imperial Parliament this session, while I shall have the honour of submitting a Bill to this House also, dealing with the subject, and when these two Bills, purely formal in their character, are adopted, the securities of Canada will be admitted to the trustee list from which they have hitherto been

excluded. My hon. friends, the leader of the Opposition, and the ex-Minister of Finance, both of whom are thoroughly familiar with this question, will realize, I am sure, the great importance of this concession which we have obtained from Great Britain: but to those who may not be so familiar with the subject, let me say that the difference between the selling price of a security admitted to the trustee list, and one shut out from that list, is from two to three points. I do not think that the hon. leader of the Opposition or the ex-Minister of Finance, will differ from me in that estimate. I think that at a later stage, we shall derive even more than that difference, because under the influence of this important step, the securities of Canada will approach very nearly the value of British consols. But, if we calculate at the moderate estimate of 2 per cent. on the loans which Canada will have to place in England in the next ten or twelve years, the saving will not be less than two and a half million dollars to the Canadian treasury.

Let me put it another way. The gain that we shall make by this action of the British Government in coming to the assistance of Canada will be, in actual cash, equal to every penny we spend for the sending of the Canadian soldiers to South Africa.

I regard this as a matter of very great consequence to the finances of Canada, and those who are acquainted with our financial affairs will fully agree with me in that opinion. Now that this important question is about to be settled, I desire again to say how much we are indebted to Lord Strathcona for

the assistance he has afforded in this matter. And I should do less than justice if I did not say also that to our excellent deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Courtney, a large share of that credit is due.

And, now, Mr. Speaker, my task is done. It is, I trust, an agreeable statement which I have been able to present to the Parliament and the people of Canada this day. It is the story of very prosperous times; of a strong financial position; of a country that has been able to pass through the recent financial stringency without the need of borrowing a dollar; of a country that has not a dollar of floating debt today; of a country with an overflowing treasury under a reduced customs tariff; of liberal grants for every useful public service; of great public enterprises, for the present and future needs of Canada, carried on with comparatively insignificant additions to the public debt; of a people occupying a vast country stretching from ocean to ocean, nearly all of whom are today busy, prosperous, contented and happy; of a people who bear cheerfully every obligation that comes upon them for the maintenance of their own public service, and who have found their devotion to the Throne and person of their sovereign so quickened by the inspiring events of recent years that they gave freely of their blood and of their treasure in defence of the honour of the empire in lands that are far away. May we all realize what a goodly land it is in which we dwell, and may we all remember with grateful hearts the blessings which Providence has showered upon this Dominion of Canada.

DALTON M'CARTHY ON PROTECTION.

There is not a manufacturing industry in this country in which there is not an understanding between the men engaged in it by which they regulate the output and fix the prices, and there is virtually no competition. What is the result? The result is that you are paying an enormous tax on what you bring into the country; that goes into the Treasury. The duty that your merchant pays to the customs house officers goes into the Treasury. He adds it to the price of his goods, his profits to that, and it comes out of the pockets of the people; but, if you deal with the home manufacturer you pay him the same price as if he had paid duty, when he has not paid anything, another 35 per cent. goes into his pocket and not into the Treasury, at all. I came to this conclusion a year ago, that I was no longer going to remain an advocate of the N. P., and saw what was going on. I could not unless I was blind, help seeing it, and I saw from the public documents the enormous output of these manufacturers.

Speaking at Creemore, D'Alton McCarthy, Q.C., said:—"I was, as you all know, a National Policy man, and now I tell you I am for as much free trade as we can get. We would be all the better if we could have it as it is in England. But that is impossible, and so I say that what this country needs now is to get down to a tariff for revenue."

SLAVERY AND PROTECTION.

Extract from speech in the House, in 1895, by G. W. W. Dawson, ex-M. P.:—

Sir, this tariff has robbed us of our liberty. It is almost as bad as slavery. What is the difference between slavery and protection? Very slight indeed. Slavery is a system under which I am deprived of my right to choose a market for my labor, under which I am robbed of my wages, under which my muscles and brains are used to benefit my owner, and under which my life is spent in toil to his wealth. Now, what is protection? It is a system under, which I am fettered in the choice of a market for the products of my labor, under which I may not exchange the fruits of my labor where I choose, and under which I have got to exchange them by such channels as are provided for me by those who have enacted this iniquitous law, called protection. I am robbed of a portion of my wages to swell the extortionate profits of those who have combined to compel me to pay this tribute to them. Slavery and protection are designed by selfish man to benefit and enrich the classes at the expense of the masses of the people.

Protection has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few. Sir, it is said by hon. gentlemen that this is not so, that we have no people of great wealth in this Dominion, but that the wealth is distributed evenly among all the people of the country.

I give in evidence against these hon. gentlemen the words of the late Sir John Abbott, who, in speaking in the Senate, 1891, said in the debate on the salary of judges:—

"I remember when a man could live in this country for one half the amount he could live on now; when the fortunes which judges in the attempt to maintain their social rank had to compete with, were not one-tenth, nor one-hundredth part of what they are now. It is not so long ago when the sight of a millionaire would have attracted crowds in the streets. Now there is not a town in the country where you could not find men who are several times millionaires."

Where did these men get their millions? From the pockets of the people. Who are these millionaires? They are the sugar refiners, the cordage manufacturers, the cotton men, the tobacco manufacturers, the owners of distilleries, and the owners of other protected industries. These are the men who have become millionaires, with whom the judges can no longer compete in the attempt to maintain their social position in the land. Under protection, these men have only to sit still, many of them, and wealth will flow in upon them without any effort on their part. Some of them today would outrival Solomon in his glory, and yet they toil not, neither do they spin.

THE NATIONAL POLICY AND THE FARMER.

Speech by J. N. Grieve, ex-M. P., on the Budget, in the House of Commons, 1895:—

What has the National Policy done for the farmers of Canada? We know something of the lavish promises made for the National Policy prior to its introduction in 1879. We know that the National Policy, it was promised, would increase the value of farm lands and would increase the value of farm products. We were told that the National policy was to provide a home market for the farmers. We were told that the National Policy was to keep our young men in our own country, secure for them steady employment, and give them a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. Let me ask, Sir, has a single one of these prophesies been fulfilled? Have farm lands increased in value? I know from my own knowledge that in my section of the country farm lands have largely depreciated in value during the last ten or fifteen years. I am within the judgment of every member of this House when I say that in that period farm property has depreciated at least from 25 to 40 per cent. Sir, I do not intend to confine myself to individual cases that could be shown throughout the different sections of the country, but I will show by figures which have been prepared by the Ontario Government that farm lands generally have very largely depreciated in value. We know, Sir, that in

1878 the Conservative party in Canada and the Conservative press as well, took the ground that the National Policy was to increase the value of farm lands. We know, Sir, that in 1878, not only many of the manufacturers, but many of the labouring men and many of the farmers of this country forsook their political allegiance, and their former political friends, and voted for the party that promised to increase the value of farm lands and the value of farm products. I take as the basis of calculation the reports of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for 1893 and 1894. Now, Sir, how have these predictions been fulfilled? These documents are official, being published by the Legislature of Ontario. I find from them that the value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario in 1883 was $655,000,000, and in 1894, $587,246,000, or a reduction of $67,754,000. But there are other things that must be considered in making the calculation. Between 1883 and 1894 1,760,000 acres of land were cleared in Ontario. Hon. gentlemen may say that the value of this land would not add to the depreciation. We know that on an ordinary farm of 100 acres or 200 acres, a piece of bush of 20 or 25 acres does not depreciate the value of the farm, but rather enhances its value. But those 1,760,000 acres of land which were cleared in those ten years were lands in new districts. The ordinary cost of clearing land is $15 or $20 an acre. I will put it at the lowest price, $15, and you will have a value of $29,400,000 that must be added to the amount of the depreciation. In 1883 there were in Ontario 213,000 farmers and in

1894, 243,000, an increase of 30,000. Hon. gentlemen may say that this shows the growing prosperity of the country. But it must not be forgotten that a large number of our farmers were young men who went into the new districts opened up by the Provincial Government. We know that during the last ten years many townships have been surveyed and opened for settlement in the Rainy River, Port Arthur, Bruce Mines, and other districts. The lands so taken up were formerly in the hands of the Government and assessed as Government lands previous to 1883, but after that time they passed into the hands of the farmers and their value has to be added to the value of farm lands in the Province, in 1894. If we take all these three items together—the ultimate loss, the cleared lands and the value of the farms—we find that $97,154,000 is the amount of depreciation of farm property in the Province of Ontario during those ten years. That is not all. There have been many permanent improvements made in those ten years. Farmers have been putting up buildings, such as new houses and new barns, they have been removing stones and stumps, they have been doing much in the way of underdraining, open draining, and so forth; and all these must be taken into account in calculating the depreciation in the value of farm lands. I think I am within the mark when I say that the depreciation in the value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario in the ten years from 1884 to 1894, amounted to no less than $140,000,000 or $150,000,000. Now, Sir,

did the Conservative party in 1878 promise that they would increase the value of farm lands? Did they promise that they would raise the prices of farm products? Sir John Macdonald himself, who was the leader of the Conservative party at that time, speaking at a large meeting in the city of Toronto, said:—

"If you desire this country to prosper; if you desire this country to rise out of the slough of despond in which it has sunk; if you desire to see manufacturers rise; if you desire to see labour employed; if you desire the emigration of our young people stopped; if you desire to bring back those who have emigrated; if you desire to see the value of land rise; if you desire prosperity, you will support the National Policy."

Mr. Speaker, I say that not one of those prophesies have been fulfilled. I do not for a single moment say that this is entirely due to the workings of the National Policy; but I have every reason to believe that it is in a great measure due to the fact that the products of our farms have been shut out to a large degree from our best markets. While it is undoubtedly true that England is the principal, if not the only market for our wheat, cheese, beef and light horses, and is a strong competitor with the United States for our surplus hay, sheep, hog products, oats, butter, apples, honey, and so forth, yet it is an admitted fact that the country to the south of us is the great market for our barley, lambs, heavy horses, poultry, eggs, peas, beans, potatoes and other roots, and many other products grown by the farmers of Cana-

da. In order to prove that the statements that I have just made are substantially correct, I think it is only fair to the House that I should give the figures, as gleaned from the statistical Year-book of 1894. During the year we exported horses to England to the value of $400,507, and to the United States horses to the value of $480,525. It should be observed that the class of horses we are exporting to England are well bred horses sent out there for military purposes and for saddle and driving purposes, a class of horses which it is almost impossible for the great mass of the farmers of Canada to raise; but the class of horses we have been shipping to the United States are heavy draught horses which are used on drays and for heavy working purposes, the class of horses that have been in the past and are at the present time easily raised by every farmer in the country.

Now, while England undoubtedly stands supreme as the great market for the world's produce, the United States is the principal market for a very large percentage of what is grown upon Canadian soil, and had Canadian shippers equal advantages in placing their products on the American market as they have on the English markets I do not hesitate to say that our exports to the United States would, in a very few years, increase by 50 or 75 per cent. It is a wonder to me when we consider the very high tariff existing between the two countries, that we are able to keep up the immense volume of trade that we do between this country and the United States. Will hon. gentlemen opposite pretend, with these facts before

them, that there is any chance of our obtaining as good a market outside of Canada in any other country as we can in the United States for many of the articles I have enumerated, and which we have to sell? Are we likely to get as good a market elsewhere for our barley, horses, lambs, small fruits, eggs, poultry, hay, and the many other articles we have to sell, and for which there is, practically, an unlimited demand in the United States. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of Canada, through their different organizations, are crying out for relief? They have a right to get relief, and, Sir, in my opinion, there is only one way in which their relief can be obtained, and that is by a frank and free interchange for the products of the soil between the two countries, or, in other words, the right to sell in the best and most convenient market, and the right to buy in the same.

THE LIBERAL PARTY.

From a speech by Sir Richard Cartwright at London, September 19, 1900.

It is not by what it has done during the last four years that the Liberal party will be judged in the future. If it is to maintain its proper position in the land, the Liberal party must be a progressive party, prepared with other measures and with fresh effort on their part to develop not merely the material but the social welfare of the people of Canada. We have not been forgetful of our duties in that respect. We are prepared to aid and assist to every reasonable extent all enterprises that present a fair prospect of fruitful return to the people of Canada. Owing to the fostering care of the Government we see at one end of Canada, in Nova Scotia, heretofore a comparatively unprogressive portion of our country, a huge iron industry, which will in all probability give employment soon to 20,000 families. At the other end, in our own province, we see great enterprises in the neighborhood of Sault Ste Marie, which will in all probability give employment to an equal number of families at this end of the Dominion. We see, further, numerous and extensive industries from one end of Canada to the other, starting up and developing, not fostered by high tariff, but which are legitimate to the country. The Government are most desirous of promoting also sound relations between

the two great classes of employers and employed and by their legislation have provided courts of conciliation, through the medium of which labor difficulties can be adjusted and expensive strikes avoided.

It is true that our present legislation is still rather tentative and is rather to be looked on as the germ of a better system than its full realization. But no man who has paid any attention to the enormous misery and far-reaching social dangers that are continually arising from strikes, especially in the United States, (and of which there are samples enough this very year) can fail to appreciate the immense importance of providing some important tribunal in which both parties can feel confident, and before which they can state their respective grievances and place their cases fairly before the general public. I speak with knowledge when I say we have had already very good cause to show that the battle is half won when we can induce the disputants to meet and hear what each other has got to say. It is not by legislative interference, but by an appeal to the mutual good sense and desire for fair play on the part alike of employers and employed that we can hope to bring about a genuine friendly sentiment between those who are eating off the same loaf, and whose interests rightly understood are not diverse but identical, and it is by the force of an intelligent public opinion, and not by the bayonet, that the Government of Canada desire to keep good order among our people. To what extent the industrial development of Canada may come to depend on the right solution of this

problem, only those who are aware of the immense injury which has resulted to British trade from the perpetual recurrence of strikes of one sort or another in the United Kingdom, and who know how perilously near the two parties have come to a state of civil war in many sections of the neighboring republic, can form an adequate judgment.

As regards our relations with other countries and especially with our motherland and with the people of the United States, we recognize that it will be our duty and our privilege, without relinquishing our right of self-government and without in any way compromising our autonomy or loading down our people with burdens too heavy to be borne, to do what in us lies to solidify and unite the various portions of the Empire nor have the least fear that Canada in the future will play aught but a most important part in any project which can be devised looking to that end. While as regards our neighbors to the south of us, even if we cannot (for the present) establish better trade relations with them than we now possess we can at least by all fair and honorable means cultivate a good understanding between them and ourselves and in so doing as I have so frequently pointed out confer a most substantial benefit both on our people and on the empire of which we form a part.

Lastly and perhaps most important task of all it will be the special duty and objects of the Liberal party so to administer the Government of this Dominion as to extinguish once and for all, I trust, those appeals to prejudice of class and race which

elsewhere have borne such fruits of evil and which in Canada of all places it is simply suicidal in a national point of view to foster or encourage. These, sir, are the aims which the Liberal party should set before it in the future, and I think that what they have done in the past affords every reasonable guarantee that they will not fail to promote them by every reasonable means in their power in the time to come.

Gentlemen, so far as I know I have laid the facts before you plainly and simply. I have given you the authority on which I have made them. I repeat again all that the Government asks, all that the Government desires, is fair play and a fair hearing, and all that they specially request of their friends here and their friends in the rest of the country is that they shall investigate for themselves the truth of the statements which the members of the Government have made through my mouth and the mouths of others of my colleagues, and if they find, as I believe they will find, that every statement we have made is one that can be substantiated by the records, or one of which you can obtain reasonable proof by looking around you and seeing the condition of the country, then I think we may fearlessly claim that on our part we have done our duty towards you and that you will be doing your duty and promoting your own interests, by renewing your lease of power to us.

THE NATIONAL POLICY.

Speech by Hon. David Mills, at London, October 6, 1877:—

The leaders of the Conservative party are calling aloud for the adoption of a "National Policy." They ask that the trade of Canada shall be kept for Canadians. They tell you that we have adopted a policy by which the people of this country are compelled to pay yearly several millions into the treasury of the United States. I deny the correctness of this allegation. I affirm that one more unfounded was never made. I say that the theory embraced in the assertion of these gentlemen is refuted by the experience not only of Canada, but of every country that has had a foreign trade. In addressing the people at Fergus a few weeks ago, I showed from our trade and navigation returns, extending over a period of twenty-two years, that the prices received by the Canadian farmers for the products sent to the American market were not, nor could they be, affected by the taxes imposed by the United States. What makes up the value of an article? The cost of the original material, the value of the labour spent upon it, the profits, and, if it is taxed, then this also must be added, and all these things are elements which go to constitute the price paid by the consumer. There is no such thing as production at a permanent loss where there is no Government interference. It is con-

trary alike to experience and common sense. We have suffered incomparably less than our neighbors during the crisis which in this country seems happily to have closed, but which in the United States is still most severely felt. I say we have suffered incomparably less than they have; and the reason is not from any superiority in our natural advantages, but because in our system of taxation we have departed less widely from the doctrines of political economists than they have done. It is satisfactory to know that the discoveries in political science, no less than the discoveries of physical science and in the industrial arts, admit of practical application. It is gratifying to know that they are rapidly finding their way through the ordinary channels of public opinion, are correcting popular errors, are reforming the laws by which the people are governed, are breaking down the artificial barriers which separate independent States commercially; nor are they void of their beneficial results, or they at last come home to every family that is sober and industrious in the forms of increased security to life and property, increased intelligence, and increased comforts. The prophesies of ruin which our opponents have recently indulged in, as a consequence of our fiscal policy, are being falsified by the returning prosperity of the country, just as similar predictions have been falsified in Great Britain, and in every other country where free trade has been established by able men, and denounced by political charlatans.

I dare say, gentlemen, you have observed that

sometimes a man with a very limited amount of information, and with little or no professional skill, undertakes to practise medicine. The country is new, the people are poor—are unable to judge accurately of his attainments. They employ him when they are ill, and, being temperate in their lives, having grown strong by industry and manly exercise—in spite of his treatment they recover. He acquires a reputation for knowledge and skill which he does not possess. He is jealous of the regular practitioner, denounces his book-learning, and endeavors to keep him out. Those on whom he has long imposed, for some time longer continue to listen to him. Another generation, however, is growing up. They have had better opportunities than their fathers—they are less simple-minded. they take the exact measure of the man of herbs with medical instincts. They know he is a quack, and they do not conceal their knowledge. He struggles hard against this opinion, and complains of being persecuted, but having spent the greater portion of his life in deceiving people into believing him what he is not, it is too late for him to begin now that study by which alone he could be qualified to become what he desires the community to consider him; and the place from which he has fallen he can never regain. We have had in Canada the same type of political doctor. You see two of them leading the Conservative party. They have lost their position and their practice. They are offering the people again their quack nostrums. But the times have changed. A new order of things has been established, with which this class

are out of joint; and they struggle hard, but vainly, against the public verdict. They still have faith in buncombe. They still hope that the public taste for being humbugged will return. They are prepared to embark on any sea of speculation, however untried; they are prepared to engage in any venture, however wild or visionary, if perchance they may regain their old places. They are ready to appeal to any prejudice or suggest any policy, no matter how mischievious it might prove, if the result only were favorable to their wishes.

Our opponents advocate what they call a "national" policy. We also advocate a national policy; and I shall endeavor to show you before I conclude my observations that the fiscal and political policy of the present Government, and of the Reform party, is alone entitled to that appellation. Does any man in his senses believe that a few cents' taxes upon breadstuffs, and a tax upon other agricultural products coming from the United States into this country, similar to that imposed by Congress upon the products of Canada, would be of any advantage to us? We have, as I have already stated, an immense mercantile marine, for which we are anxious to find employment. It is growing up without protective tariffs and without Government interference. It carries the products of Canada to every quarter of the globe where a suitable market can be found. It affords to capital a profitable investment, and to many mechanics and artisans remunerative employment. It engages the services of many thousands of our people

fond of adventure, and who are obliged to encounter those storms and perils of the sea by which the mind not less the body is invigorated, and by which habits of self-reliance are acquired. Is this source of wealth and prosperity of no consequence? Are those who invest their capital in ship building and ships—are the hardy mariners who man them—to be eliminated as of no account in the elements of natural growth and national prosperity?

I need not discuss the effect of a retaliatory policy upon the prosperity of the agriculturists of this country. As an agriculturist living in a neighboring county, the climate and products of which are similar to your own, I shall oppose to the utmost of my ability a policy that would prove in the least degree injurious to the farmers of Canada. You may depend on this, gentlemen, that the Government who impose a tax upon imports, to that extent at least tax their own people. During the past four years we imported from the United States cereals to the value of $55,000,000, and we exported thither to the value of $34,224,620, or we imported into Canada $20,822,754 worth more than we exported to that country. Now, were we damaged by this excess? Would it have been a wise thing on the part of the Government to have imposed a tax that would have kept this excess out? I say no. I say our people are engaged in this trade because they found it profitable. Let me ask for a moment to consider what we did with this surplus which we imported. We imported wheat and flour from the United States in these four years in

excess of what we sent there to the value of twenty-nine millions of dollars. We sent to England forty-two million dollars worth of breadstuffs during the same period, twenty-nine millions worth of which were the product of the United States, and thirteen millions worth the product of Canada. The American wheat which we imported and sent to England would have gone there through American channels had we imposed an import duty upon it, and those Canadians engaged in the milling and carrying trades have made more than three times the gain they would have done had we adopted a policy of exclusion.

There is one product in which I am told you have a special interest—I refer to the production of corn. I will take the year 1874 as an example, because the prices then were more nearly a mean average, taking several years together, than were the prices of 1876. Well, in 1874 we imported into Canada 5,331,000 bushels of corn, at about 43 cents per bushel; 2,657,000 bushels of this were re-shipped to Europe at about 61 cents a bushel, that is, at a profit of 18 cents a bushel, or $447,180 on the whole transaction. Now, the country is richer by nearly half a million dollars in consequence of the importation and exportation of these 2,657,000 bushels of corn. Let me consider for a moment whether we have gained or lost by the two and three-quarter millions of this corn consumed at home. If we take but three quarters of a million of bushels as the quantity that has been consumed by lumbermen and farmers, you have an equal quantity of peas and barley displaced—peas,

however, more largely than barley. The mean average difference for the past four years between corn on the one hand, and peas and barley on the other, is about 30 cents per bushel, or upon three quarters of a million of bushels $300,000—a total gain to the country each year upon the corn imported of $777,180. Let me ask you, gentlemen, how much corn do you export from your country in a single year? If your farmers were to produce on an average 100 bushels each more than they consumed—and this is far beyond what they do in the most favored corn growing district on the continent—and we were to give you a protection of ten cents per bushel, it would only amount in all to $50,000. But I am told that you find it much more advantageous to use your corn in the production of pork than to send it abroad, and that less than 50,000 bushels are shipped from your country; so that the taxation suggested would give you less than $5,000 additional profit. If this corn was consumed in the country it would not add a farthing to the national wealth; and if it went abroad how could any duty help you? for the price which the dealers could afford to pay would depend on the foreign market, which could not be affected by any taxes imposed by us. I would ask you in all seriousness, do you think that the Canadian Parliament would be justified in putting a tax on corn which would give to each farmer in Essex one dollar a year more than at present, when by so doing they would entail upon the country an absolute loss of three-quarters of a million of dollars, not including the loss sustained by

a necessary reduction of the excise. But no such advantage as the one I have mentioned could possibly accrue to you from such a tax. The indirect consequences resulting from any disturbance of a prosperous and profitable trade would injure you much more than any such restriction could help you. Providence has wisely constituted the world in such a way that men are mutually dependent upon each other. No merchant would be helped by having his customers beggared; and no more can one portion of our people be made permanently wealthy and prosperous by the impoverishment of those with whom they are indissolubly united. I say, then, gentlemen, that the system of taxation recommended to your consideration by our political opponents is not entitled to the appellation of a national policy.

FARMERS AND THE TARIFF.

From speech by Hon. Sydney Fisher, in the House of Commons:—

The policy on behalf of the farmers of the two great political parties is entirely different. The Tory Government offered by protection to provide a home market for the farmers, and failed.

They offered by a system of duties to raise the price of farm products, and failed.

They took ill considered plans of doing something which the farmers were much better able to do for-themselves, and failed.

They proposed in the last days of their power, when making their last appeal to the electorate, to establish a system which one of the best of their own agricultural representatives has since categorically condemned.

It was no wonder that in 1896 the farmers condemned them.

Since 1896 Sir Charles Tupper is appealing to the farmers because he says he would get preference for them in the English market and thereby give them an advantage over their competitors.

The Liberal Government have pursued an entirely different course. They have provided effectively those facilities for transport which our trade requires. They have given the instruction necessary to the farmers to show them how best to prepare their products for the markets of the world.

Both by legislation and administration they have provided the necessary machinery to facilitate and improve production in Canada.

By arrangements with the United States they have obtained access for our cattle to that market, and above all and more important than all, by the preference they have accorded the motherland in the markets of Canada they have secured an appreciation of Canada, its people and its products, amongst the English consumers such as never existed before.

Sir Charles Tupper demands of England that she should do something contrary to her whole well established and wonderfully successful fiscal system, something which her leading statesmen have declared it is impossible to consider. Even suppose it were, in the dim future, to become possible, the Conservatives themselves acknowledge that it is in the future and not in the present.

The Liberal policy has already secured for Canada a preference in the English market, which is one of the main causes of the fact that today our products are going to England in enormously increasing quantities, and our farmers are there receiving prices which they never received before.

Today Canadian butter, Canadian cheese, Canadian fruits and Canadian flour are being asked for and searched for by the English consumer.

Under the Conservative Administration the same articles were being sold in the English markets under other names and false brands.

This is an advantage not for the future, not to be

obtained by a struggle against the will of the whole British nation, but an advantage which has been secured with the hearty good will of these people, obtained at the same time that we have received a cordial appreciation as an integral part of the Empire, and have shown that we are, through weal or woe, in times of war as well as peace, an aid and a comfort to the motherland instead of demanding from that motherland a sacrifice which it must hurt her to give.

QUALITIES OF A GREAT STATESMAN.

Speech by Hon. G. W. Ross, at Massey Music Hall, Toronto, February 5th, 1895:—

Among one of the heresies of my early youth was the impression (how it was formed I can hardly tell) that the Province of Ontario never received full justice in the old Parliament of Ontario from the Province of Quebec. For that reason I looked with some little suspicion upon the impartiality of the representatives of Quebec when they came to deal with matters affecting the interests of Ontario. Allow me to say now, and say it without any reservation whatsoever, that in the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier's career not a single circumstance, so far as I know, has occurred to justify such a preconception. On the contrary, his public utterances as well as his speeches in the House of Commons have unmistakably shown his determination to do full justice to the Province of Ontario even against the views of a majority of the representatives from his own Province and in cases too, where local popularity might be obtained by an opposite course. As a notable instance of his rectitude and impartiality in this respect, let me cite his conduct with regard to the Boundary Award. You will doubtless remember that during Mr. Mackenzie's administration, arbitrators were appointed to determine the Western limits of the Province of Ontario, the understanding being that their report should be subject to the approval of the House of Commons and the

legislature of Ontario. As the Mackenzie Government was defeated before the House of Commons had an opportunity of confirming the award it remained for Sir John Macdonald to advise Parliament with regard to its validity. Contrary to expectations, Sir John MacDonald refused to submit the award for ratification although repeatedly urged to do so by the Local Legislature. Naturally enough his action aroused a great deal of public feeling, particularly in the Province mostly interested, for to us in Ontario the consequences involved were of the most serious character. To refuse to ratify the award was to refuse the possession to Ontario of 100,000 square miles of territory declared by the arbitrators to be ours, and when we remember that this territory was as large almost as the area of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, larger by 40,000 square miles than England and Wales, ten times as large as the State of Massachusetts and twice as large as the State of New York it will be seen how much was at stake. It was a territory worth fighting for, and the Government of Ontario did fight for it. What position did Mr. Laurier take in that issue? Did he listen to the representations from his own Province that to confirm the award would be to increase the preponderance of Ontario both as to territory and representation in the Councils of the nation? Or, did he look upon the question as one of abstract justice, irrespective of consequences? Let us hear what he said. Speaking in the House of Commons on the 4th of April, 1882, he used the following words:—

"I have no hesitation in saying this award is binding on both parties, and should be carried out in good faith. The consideration that the great Province of Ontario may be made greater I altogether lay aside as unfair, unfriendly, and unjust. This is not a question of expediency, it is a question of justice. I do not grudge to Ontario the extent of territory declared to be hers under this award, and which does not constitute even the whole of what she is entitled to, according to the opinion of one of the most learned and industrious of my countrymen. The eternal principles of justice are far more important than thousands or millions of acres of land, and I say let us adhere to those principles of justice and in doing so we will have the surest foundation for security on every occasion."

I commend to the citizens of Ontario the noble stand taken by the learned leader of the Liberal party on a question so deeply affecting the interests of Ontario, and taken many years before he had any expectation to be the leader of a great party. There was no truckling for local support, no studied effort to evade a great issue, but on the contrary a broad statesmanlike and manly declaration that be the consequences what they may, the principles of justice should prevail. We thank him for his manly utterances and we rejoice in the honest motives which inspired him to espouse the cause of our beloved Province.

The year following another question arose Sir John Macdonald had cast a covetous eye upon the

large revenues received by Ontario from the Licenses System. No doubt he also thought that the control of the liquor traffic involved a certain amount of political influence which he could use to his own advantage. Although the Privy Council had declared that the sale of intoxicating liquors was within the jurisdiction of the Province, Sir John MacDonald insisted that the Dominion Government had the right to issue tavern licenses and accordingly he prevailed upon his then friend, Mr. Dalton McCarthy, to introduce a License Act. As this was a Liquor Bill the discussions upon it were not so dry as on the Boundary Award referred to. To the Province of Ontario, it was however, of the greatest importance, from various standpoints.

There were involved in it revenues amounting to $300,000 a year, so far as the Province of Ontario was concerned, and another $300,000 a year so far as the municipalities were concerned—more than half a million in all. They had enjoyed these revenues for many years, and they could see no reason why they should be deprived of them. And, more important, there was the federal principle involved, because if the licensing power could be taken from the Provinces what would prevent them taking away the control of education, and other powers entrusted to the Provinces, until the whole fabric of Confederation should fall to pieces? What position did their leader take on that question? Did he take the position of his fellow-citizens of Quebec of the Conservative party? Let him speak for himself. In the House of Commons, on

the 18th of March, 1884, he said with regard to the right of the Provinces to legislate respecting licenses.

"In my humble judgment, this is an infringement upon the powers of the Provinces. It cannot be otherwise; and I ask the attention of those who value this Federal system, when I enquire if the object of the amendment is not, in the end, to deprive the Provinces of the right which legitimately pertains to them today. It is a step towards legislative union. Every successful attempt made on the floor of this parliament to deprive any Province of any power now exercised by that Province, however insignificant that power may be, is a successful step in the direction of legislative union." And, said Mr. Ross, he might have added, subversive of Confederation. That was the stand Mr. Laurier took on that question, and he thanked him for it, as a believer in Confederation. If they made any break in the autonomy of Provincial rights the whole fabric of Confederation would fall, and their only guarantee for the system was that the House of Commons should not use its tremendous power to the derogation of the powers of the Provinces, small or large.

Mr. Laurier's course on these two questions—the Boundary Award and the License Laws—indicated pretty clearly his integrity of character and his respect for the fundamental principles of our federal system, and had I nothing else to offer, I have no doubt you would deem them a sufficient basis for your confidence. They are not, however, the only grounds for which he is entitled to our esteem. Not

only has he advocated a policy which is sound constitutionally, and which has been confirmed as a matter of law by the decisions of the Privy Council, but Mr. Laurier represents all that is best in Canadian and British statesmanship. Let us not forget in these days of National Consolidation and I trust also of national unity the part played by the sister Province of Quebec in the history of Canada, for every person familiar with the events of the past fifty years knows that we owe a great deal to the sympathy and intelligence and legislative ability of our sister Province. Fifty years ago, when the foundations of responsible government were being laid, who was it clasped hands with Robert Baldwin to carry out the plan sketched so ably by Lord Durham, was it not Lafontaine, the hero of the French in Lower Canada? Who clasped hands with George Brown to help him carry out this grand policy of Confederation, was it not Sir George Cartier? And a distinguished French-Canadian, M. Etienne Tache, had declared that it would be a French-Canadian who would fire the last gun in defence of British connection. We should recognize the loyal attachment of our Quebec friends to the principle of good government; we should recognize that peace would not be attained by a cleavage of races and creeds, but by establishing unity and harmony in all. Mr. Laurier's own record in Canadian political history had been in accordance with these anticedents. In 1874 he had supported the introduction of the vote by ballot into all elections for Dominion purposes. For four or five years he had supported Hon. Mr.

Mackenzie in his policy of economy and rectitude. In 1878 he had, as now, upheld a revenue tariff as the proper fiscal system for Canada. In 1882 he opposed the gerrymander, by which some of the ablest men in Canadian public life had their seats assailed. In 1883 he had opposed the taking of the licensing power from the Provinces. In 1885 he had opposed the Dominion Franchise Act. Later on he had been the consistent, earnest advocate of purity in the House of Commons, and in these particulars, he had set forth the best qualities in the continuity of Canadian government with the British system and in connection of the best qualities of Canadian with English statesmanship, and in this connection also he could point to Mr. Laurier and his utterances. In 1887 at the Academy of Music in Quebec Mr. Laurier used the following language:—

"What is grander than the history of the great English Liberal party during the present century? On its threshold looms up the figure of Fox, the wise, the generous Fox, defending the cause of the oppressed, wherever there were oppressed to be defended. A little later comes O'Connell, claiming and obtaining for his co-religionists the rights and privileges of British subjects. He is helped in this work by all the Liberals of the three kingdoms—Grey, Brougham, Russell, Jeffrey and a host of others, such as Bright, Cobden and Gladstone. Then come, one after the other, the abolition of the ruling oligarchy by the repeal of the corn laws, the extension of the suffrage to the working classes, and, lastly, to crown the whole, disestab-

lishment of the Church of England as the state religion in Ireland."

What a comprehensive expression of fealty is here given to the best qualities of statesmanship. He mentioned Fox; what did he learn from him? In 1774, when the Quebec Act was under discussion, Fox laid down the principle, which he regretted, had not been at once adopted, that if England was to maintain her connection with her colonies for any length of time it would be only by delegating to them a large measure of self-government. Had the English Government taken Fox's advice it might have been spared the Revolutionary War and subsequent declaration of independence, and Canada might have been spared a rebellion in Ontario and Quebec, and would have got responsible government sooner. Mr. Laurier mentioned Burke; what had he learned from him? In Burke's speech to the electors of Bristol these words were found:—

"I have held and ever shall maintain to the best of my power, unimpaired and undiminished, the just. wise and necessary constitutional superiority of Great Britain. I never mean to put any colonist or any human creature in a position not becoming a free man."

Mr. Laurier had illustrated well that night how thoroughly he had learned this noble lesson from Burke. From O'Connell he had learned that the integrity of the British constitution depended upon justice being done to Roman Catholics as well as to Protestants, and in giving to each their legitimate

share in the responsibilities and privileges of government and administration. What had he learned from Lord John Russell, the champion of the Reform Bill of 1832, who revised the constituencies of Great Britain and did not gerrymander one? He taught that the people of England had a right to be heard upon questions of government, and that there should be a just distribution of political power and responsibility; and Mr. Laurier had learned the lesson well. He learned from Brougham that the safety of democracy depended upon the spread of education, and that free schools should be established all over the country. From John Bright he learned that the commerce of England, fettered by restrictive tariffs, was weak and halting in comparison with the magnificent sweep of that commerce when the fetters were removed. What had their leader learned of William Ewart Gladstone, the noblest Roman of them all—of whom it might be said as Tennyson said of Galahad, one of the knights of the Round Table, "His strength was as the strength of ten, because his heart was pure." From Mr. Gladstone he had learned that the masses have rights as well as the classes; he learned that conciliation is a stronger motive power than coercion; that "corruption wins not more than honesty." And with these lessons in his heart our friend comes and asks for our confidence. We shall give it. They sent their young men from Canada to Oxford to study the classics and for philosophy to the great German universities, they sent their artists to Italy. To the grand old masters of England they should go for their lessons in

free and representative government. If they sent their young men to that school they would raise a generation of statesmen who would put an end to impurity in the administration of public affairs; sound, economic principles would prevail, which would unfetter this young giant from the shackles of trade restriction and they would enter upon an era of prosperity for Canada. Mr. Laurier is of another race from me. He speaks English with a French accent, but some of us speak it with a Doric accent. But as that was the language of Paradise we have kept the accent. But Mr. Laurier was a Canadian—a broad, strong Canadian. There was a species of Canadians with so little vertebra that it was impossible to tell whether they were vegetable marrow or vegetable oysters. Some men were like Boston chips, so shriveled up that it was impossible to tell what manner of men they were under the garments the tailors had put upon them. Mr. Laurier was not that kind of a Canadian. His words spoke for him. In a speech delivered at Somerset on the 2nd August, 1889, immediately after his assumption of the leadership of the party after Mr. Blake's retirement, he said:—

"For my part I may say that as long as I shall occupy a place in the confidence of my party, as long as I shall fill a seat in the Legislature, and as long as by word and example I can preach this doctrine, I shall devote my political life to spreading among my fellow-countrymen the love of our national institutions. I know that the task is a great one and that I dare not hope to carry it to a successful issue my-

self. The most I can do is to trust that I may advance it a step, but at least the work is worthy of our efforts. And for my part, when the hour for final rest shall strike, and when my eyes shall close forever, I shall consider, gentlemen, that my life has not been altogether wasted if I shall have contributed to heal one patriotic wound in the heart of even a single one of my fellow-countrymen, and to thus have promoted even to the smallest extent the cause of concord and harmony between the citizens of the Dominion."

Three lines more from a speech delivered by Mr. Laurier when proposing the toast of "Canada" before the National Club:—"Gentlemen, I once more propose the toast of 'Canada.' Let us resolve that never shall we introduce into this country the disputes and quarrels which have drenched Europe in blood; that in the country order and freedom shall forever reign; that all the races shall dwell together in harmony and peace, and that the rights of the strong shall weigh no more in the balance with us than the rights of the weak."

I like these sentiments. They have the genuine ring. "Harmony and peace," the key of the situation. Without harmony what chance has our fair Dominion in its struggles for the supremacy of the northern half of this continent. It is by "Harmony and Peace" that this great Confederation can be welded into a union, one and inseparable. It is by "Harmony and Peace" among its inhabitants that the true spirit of patriotism can be cultivated.

The dwellers of the sea in far-off, beautiful Acadia; the industrious inhabitants of Quebec; the sturdy yeomanry of Ontario; the settlers of the prairies of the Northwest; and the gold seekers of Columbia must all unite in harmony and peace if the Dominion of Canada is ever to secure for itself a place among the nations of the world, and we believe the sooner a Liberal government is installed at Ottawa the sooner they would enter upon a better day when a spirit of pure harmony would prevail throughout the whole Dominion. Mr. Laurier says:—"Let us resolve that never shall we introduce into this country the disputes and quarrels that have drenched Europe in blood." A noble resolve, worthy of the man, and it is to be hoped worthy of the country on whose behalf it should be made. Have any of you forgotten the terrible struggle of a few months ago between the reactionary forces of intolerance and the higher forces of liberty of conscience, in which the people of Ontario engaged with an intensity characteristic of the dark ages. What a reflection upon our enlightened institution, was the fact that in a thousand garrets with lights turned low, hundreds of men assembled from time to time and pledged their souls' salvation to ostracize their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens and deprive them of all civil and political promotion. Even the Legislative Assembly of this great Province was invaded by the evil spirit of sectarianism, and grave men who should regard every public question in a judicial spirit shrieked forth their husky calumnies against their fellow-citizens, and some with Ryer-

sonian recklessness were even prepared to cry "havoc and let slip the dogs of war." The public atmosphere was filled with such sulphurous fumes that even Mephistopheles himself was in danger of prostration. Political opinion like the witches' cauldron in Macbeth gave forth the most offensive oders. But the end had not come. The bigot who told the people of Ontario that Protestantism was in danger, like the weird sisters who lied to Macbeth, was found to be lying to the people of Ontario, and as Birnam Wood moved upon Dunsinane to the overthrow of Macbeth, so the fresh, unshaken confidence of Ontario moved upon the seared ranks of intolerence and under the leadership of their gallant chief, their own Macduff—Sir Oliver Mowat—they had dealt the murderous usurper, the false exponent of Canadian opinion such a crushing defeat on the 26th of June last as to render him helpless and harmless for all time to come. That this spirit may never be favored with a resurrection should be the prayer of every true Canadian.

By way of contrast let us consider how British statesmen look upon the question as regarding the personal opinions and religious convictions of their fellow subjects. Let me give you one illustration—a somewhat tragic one—within the range of our experience. Three months ago Sir John Thompson went to England to be sworn as a member of the Privy Council. There was no question as to his nationality or his creed; he was a man of great perseverance and of great ability, and Her Majesty rejoiced to honor such men. Conservatives and Liberals rejoiced at the hon-

or paid him. They remembered him as the boy in his father's printing office, as the reporter in the gallery of the Local Legislature, as the law student in his office, as the judge on the bench, as the arbitrator at Paris, as the leader of the House of Commons, and they rejoiced in his prosperity, rejoiced that a Canadian was so honored. There was but one feeling of admiration for the wisdom of Her Majesty's Privy Council in summoning such a man to her councils, That was the way it was looked upon in England. Death came all too soon.

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath,
And stars to fade, but all,
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, O! death.

The great man in whose advancement Liberals and Conservatives alike rejoiced, died within the citadel which he had captured by the strength of his own right arm. A death more tragic the novelist could hardly conceive. The dead statesman is borne away by the officers of Her Majesty's household and in a chamber in that historic castle he lies within his coffin, but not forgotten. Her Majesty, the head of the Protestant faith is not forgetful of the loving service of a subject, Roman Catholic though he was, and with her own hand places upon his coffin a memorial wreath of affection and esteem that all her loving subjects the world over may know how deeply she appreciated the services which he rendered to his coun-

try and to the Empire. God bless Her Majesty for this loving, noble, womanly act of hers, for to be womanly is to be queenly in the highest sense of the term. Where is the Canadian recollecting her sympathy with Canada in the hour of its bitterest bereavement who will not hereafter sing with intensest loyalty:

Send her victorious,
Happy and glorious.
Long to reign over us,
God save the Queen.

And yet, I fear, that although Sir John Thompson was honored thus by the Queen, there have been times in the history of Toronto when he could not have been elected for No. 1 Ward, so greatly does the spirit of religious intolerance overwhelm every other motive of action. Let us hope, however, that we are on the eve of a better day. Let us hope that the respect paid by Her Majesty to one of our people, irrespective of nationality or creed, will give us a higher conception of what we owe to Canadian citizenship and of the spirit which should animate every elector, both in private life and at the ballot box. The Liberal party through their leader proclaims to the people of Canada a gospel of Canadian brotherhood irrespective of racial or denominational differences. The gospel he proclaims is the refrain of that angelic message of peace on earth good will to men, first heard on the plains of Bethlehem. It is the echo of Wolsey's words to Cromwell, "Let all the ends

thou aimest at be thy Country's, God's and Truth, then if thou fallest, oh, Cromwell, thou fallest a glorious martyr." It is the bugle cry of humanity whose echoes roll from soul to soul forever and forever. That gospel, if rightly understood, will overthrow corruption wherever it exists, will abolish all preferences, all special advantages which a false tariff is calculated to give, will do justice to all parties and all creeds, will break down all party differences which are calculated to retard the prosperity of the country, will promote that righteousness which exalteth a nation and will bind in bonds of perpetual friendship the provinces to each other and the whole to the great Empire to which we so happily belong.

THE CONSERVATIVE POLICY.

Speech of Hon. Alex. Mackenzie at Clinton, July 5th, 1877:—

I see before me many of the grey-haired veterans who have settled this country, and I see also a multitude of the faces of young persons whom I desire to indoctrinate to some slight extent with the general views which I have of the policy of the Conservative Government which existed before our own, and of the policy of the Conservative leaders of the present time. You will all remember that in 1867 Sir John Macdonald, Mr. Howland, Mr. William Macdougall, and a few other choice spirits were making a tour through the country, telling the people there was no further occasion for continuing the lines which had separated the two political parties in the past, and asking them to join in a grand union of parties having only one purpose in view—that of governing the country wisely and well.

So, cried they, let us cast aside our late designations of Tory and Grit, and let us use them no more for ever. Well, sir, a small proportion, probably about five per cent. of the whole electorate, believed in this profession, but it soon turned out that these no-party professions were used simply to obtain a temporary majority by what we may very fairly term a catch vote. I knew at the time that it was utterly impossible for these men to carry out their professions

of no-party allegiance with which they came before the public.

No sooner were the elections over than the miserable representative—the only representative at the time—of the Liberal party in the Cabinet was sent about his business on the pretext of being made Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and the Cabinet became a purely Conservative one; for Alexander Morris, one of the most decided Conservatives in Canada, the present Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, was selected to fill Mr. Macdougall's place as the representative in the Cabinet of the Liberal party at that time. In 1872, as soon as they managed to get a term of administration, the union and progress principle was cast adrift, and they hoisted the party flag again, and their sole aim and object became apparent.

That object was not, as they had falsely alleged in 1867, to secure the perfection of our system of government, but simply to endeavor to get and keep themselves in power. Their sole object in coming before the country now is to oust the present administration and put themselves in their places. In England it has been known that the Government would resign, and the other party, feeling that there was nothing to justify them in assuming the reins of Government, would decline to do so. This has happened once and again within our lifetime.

But the question with these gentlemen is not what principles are to be defended in Parliament, or what the Conservative party is to do when it gets into office; the first question with them is to get there, and

then they will trust to chance and circumstances to enable them to meet the obligations of the moment. Now, sir, you will remember this, that the Liberal party remained out of office for twenty years, and they accepted it upon such conditions as would not merely give them office, but the hope of carrying out their principles.

In 1864, the Liberal party defeated Sir John Macdonald's Government. One day Sir John spoke strongly against all constitutional changes on principle; he said there was no necessity for any change whatever, and he refused his assent to any change. This was on the 14th of April. On the 15th his Government was defeated, and then, sir, we said to him, "If you choose to adopt the constitutional changes that we have prepared for your needs ten years ago, you can retain your office—only give us our principles." And they did it. They would do anything on earth—they would revolutionize this country; they would sever its connection with Great Britain, in fact, I believe in my heart there is nothing that the principal Tory leaders are not prepared to adopt as a policy—provided it serves to keep or get them into office. And what has been their course this year, and indeed for the last two years? It has been one of uniform contemptible denunciation of their opponents, with no object in view, without having any principle at stake, but simply an endeavor, first, to unite all the Conservative party together; and, secondly, to detach, if they can, some of my supporters in Parlia-

ment or in the country, so as to enable them to reach office.

I have read their speeches, one after another, and except their violent denunciations of myself and my colleagues as incompetent, as blunderers, as traitors, as fraudulent men, as everything that can be conceived to be bad, there is absolutely nothing in them but intimations that they should have such and such a majority in such and such provinces at the next election, and that they are sure to get in power within the next few months. I believe, and I have always believed, that it would be most disastrous to the Liberal party to remain in power one moment longer than they can keep their principles and carry them into effect by practical legislation. And although I do not pretend to be lacking in a feeling of pride in the position I have received at the hands of the people of Canada, I do say that I would take infinitely more pleasure in sitting on the furthest back bench of the House of Commons as a purely independent member of Parliament than to occupy the first of the Treasury benches if compelled, in order to occupy that seat, to propound a policy at variance with my previous utterances to the great party which I have the honour to lead. Sir, I hope there is still left in this country such a thing as high-mindedness in political life. There is such a thing amongst the public men in England, whom it is our humble desire to imitate—those who govern the empire of which we form a part. There was such a spirit in such men as Disraeli and Palmerston and Derby, and who will doubt its ex-

istence in the minds of such great political leaders as Gladstone and John Bright. I had an opportunity, two years ago, of mixing with these men, and listening to their debates, and of noticing the decorum which characterizes all their utterances; and I observed the entire absence of the extreme democratic violence which pervades the would-be aristocratic class of this country. But, sir, until we learn to use our own political system and our own Parliamentary life with a view—to use my own words uttered in 1874, and which I reiterate now—to elevate the standard of public morality in this country, you will never find that the great political parties which must manage the Government in this country have reached or can occupy properly the places the country has assigned to them.

I am glad to know, not only by the presence of this vast multitude today, but from what I have learned at other gatherings, that there are indications everywhere over the country that the policy which has been pursued by our own Administration in the past has commended itself to the people of Canada. I may refer to what happened the day before yesterday. Dr. Fortin, who was speaker of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada, was the member for Gaspe. I knew him well, as a very worthy gentleman, though when we were in Parliament together he sat on the side opposite to me. He was unseated for bribery at the election—not by himself, but by his agents. A new election was ordered, and Mr. Fortin, who was formerly elected almost without opposition, was opposed

by our friend Mr, Flynn, of Quebec, a man who has the disadvantage of not living in the county, but who was elected by hundreds of a majority. Mr. Speaker Anglin has been again elected member for Gloucester by a majority of 350, notwithstanding all the abuse which has been heaped upon him, and the gross injustice with which he has been treated by the Conservative press. Every kind of means is being used by our opponents which they hope will help them in carrying the elections. In Lower Canada the Liberals of that Province—I mean the political Liberals—have been denounced by the supreme ecclesiastical authority there, and the Opposition hope that this will prevent the free exercise of the franchise by the electors of that Province.

Then in the county vacated by my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Pelletier, the Liberal candidate, was defeated by a small number, his defeat being doubtless due to this same influence and agency; but a few weeks later, when that agency was removed, one of our own friends was re-elected for the Local Legislature in the same county—thus indicating that, instead of there being a reaction in favor of the Conservative element in political life, the reaction has set in the other way, and that there is no shadow of a doubt of the main Provinces of the Dominion retaining almost, if not entirely, the relative positions which they now occupy.

I was not surprised at our losing some counties since the general election. We then elected about three-fourths of the whole House, or at all events 133

or 134, while the total number was 206; and we knew that some seats which were carried might be lost to us on a future occasion. The total result since the general election is that we lost thirteen seats, and the Opposition party four, leaving a difference of nine, from what it was at the general election.

I know very well that with the great Province of Ontario, if there is any difference it is simply because such causes as those I have alluded to have prevailed, namely, that the Conservative party are determined to reunite on their late leader, no matter what may have been his sins, no matter what are his proclivities. They are determined again to unite on him, to let him carry their banner as of old, hoping that his personal popularity and the great ability which distinguishes him as a public man will enable him to recover and retain his old place. That is a matter which will rest with the people of this country themselves. I am not disposed to boast, because boasting, like scolding, accomplishes little.

But I am merely disposed to say this—that I have not only entire confidence in the people of my native Province, but in the public opinion of the country, which I believe to be sound over the greater part of the whole of this Dominion. But, sir, whether they shall succeed or not, whether that wave which they call a Conservative reaction shall bear them into office or not, it makes no difference whatever to the policy of the Liberal party. Our policy is to carry out our views when we are in the Government, and when we cease to be able to do that then we will be

willing to pass out, as my friend Mr. Mowat did in 1864.

He and his friends had a majority in the House; it is true it was only a majority of some one or two, but still it was a majority. The Opposition was rather factious, as the same Opposition are now, and the consequence was that they had votes of want of confidence every day; in fact we had them for breakfast, dinner and supper. It was impossible for one of us to go out and wash our faces for fear we would be voted out during our absence. But Mr. Mowat and his colleagues, rather than submit to this kind of constant torture, resigned their seats and let the Conservatives come in. A month afterwards they were defeated, and then they adopted the Liberal policy, and gave us anything we wanted if they were only allowed to retain their places.

A good deal has been said of late regarding the commercial depression which has existed over the country for the last two or three years; and in that respect the Liberal party has undoubtedly been most fortunate. We came into power at the moment that Mr. Tilley, the Finance Minister of the late Government, had announced his belief that the importations of the country could not be kept up, and that more taxation would be necessary next session.

We came in at the time that our moneyed institutions were feeling the strain imposed by the inability of dealers to sell their lumber and manufactured goods and by the general want of prosperity which prevailed alike in Great Britain and the United States. And,

sir, we had to contend with these and other difficulties. My friend Mr. Mowat has alluded today to some of the causes of the prosperity which existed from 1867 to 1873, but he did not mention the one great fact that during that period the sum of nearly $17,000,000 had been expended on the Intercolonial, and on the Ontario railways not less than about $20,000,000.

These enormous sums being circulated through the country gave a temporary and fictitious prosperity to many branches of trade, and when these heavy expenditures ceased, those branches were the first to feel the depression. The Government were then the first to have the blame thrown upon them for having accomplished something like an injury to the country.

Some people appear to think that the Administration had some object to serve in producing a depression; but it must be very obvious that not only our prosperity as individuals, but as a Government, is bound up in the prosperity of the country and that we are bound by our interest as well as by our duty to do all in our power to promote that prosperity. When our manufacturers made a demand for more protection, it was in vain that we pointed out the fact that in the United States, where protection was adopted as a principle, the result was that prices were much higher, money was much scarcer, and labour worse paid than in Canada. It was in vain that we pointed to the interest of our working classes, as they are called; though the truth is we are all workingmen

in this country; we have all to live more or less by the exercise of our industry.

But on behalf of the great mass of our working population we pointed out that according to official statistics in the United States the prices of labour rose from 1860, when their protective system began, to 1873, when an agitation of a decided character sprang up against it, exactly sixty per cent; that is to say, a man who received $1 before received $1.60 then, while the prices of commodities entering into household consumption rose 92 per cent; so that the working man who has to buy his clothes, his food, his tea, and everything required by himself and his family, would have to pay 32 per cent. more than the increase in the price of his labour. In other words he was a loser to that extent. We found at Philadelphia last year that we could hire all the men we wanted in that great city for 90 cents to $1.10 greenbacks per day, while at Ottawa we had to pay $1.25 in gold to our workmen. But the manufacturers, many of whom were our own political friends, were under the impression that a system of protection would not only benefit them, but the farmers as well, by opening up a home market for agricultural produce.

Well, sir, it is an utter delusion. It is utterly impossible that the prices for farm products can be raised here except by a rise in the markets of the world, and these are controlled by England. I remember making a tour in the Western States a few years ago, just before I assumed office. I not only made a tour on the railway, but I drove a good deal across the

country. I found on inquiry among the farmers of Iowa that while we were getting $1.15 in gold for our wheat they were getting 87 cents in greenbacks; and in the matter of cattle we were getting nearly 40 per cent. more than they were, on account of the long transportation. They found these rates so unprofitable that they almost ceased production. At the same time I met a clergyman who came from that country every year to visit his friends in London, and he could pay his passage both ways and have something over on the difference between the cost of a suit of broadcloth in Canada and in Iowa. I found that every agricultural machine was about 50 per cent. higher there than here, and with regard to boots and shoes and many other articles the same was true. I tell you this system of protection for protection's sake is a fallacy and a mistake, and the effect it would have upon such of you as are farmers would be, that you would get nothing more for your produce, and you would pay perhaps 50 per cent. more for everything you have to buy. I have to appeal to the great farming community of this country. I know I cannot sustain myself or the Administration except with their help and support.

I have to appeal to the manufacturers as well. I pointed out to them a year ago, when they came to me, that it was quite possible we could benefit them by excluding all other manufactures of the kind manufactured by themselves, thereby enabling them to charge their own prices; and when they say that they would still be able to sell at their own prices, one

naturally asks: "If you can, why do you ask for protection?" As to the effects of protection, I would instance the shipping interest of Great Britain.

Up to 1860—at which time the British tonnage laws were repealed, and the laws of navigation changed to throw open the commerce of Great Britain to the whole world—because there was freedom of commerce in the United States' marine, their ships pushed far ahead, and even threatened soon to overtake our boasted British supremacy on the ocean. But after the restrictions were removed in England—after a man was allowed to build a ship of such a shape as he pleased and go where he wished, this open competition had such an effect that the British marine bounded forward, and it is now double what it was at that time, and is so far ahead of the United States' marine that the latter is not worthy to be mentioned in comparison with that of Great Britain. In 1873 the foreign trade of the United States at the Port of New York was in the proportion of 73 per cent. of American bottoms, to only 27 per cent. of those of all other nations. Last year, under the operation of the system of protection which now prevails, there were twenty-one per cent. of American bottoms, seventy-per cent of British bottoms, and about ten per cent. of those of all other nations. I mention this as a simple illustration of the effects of protection.

A great trade has sprung up lately in exporting cattle to England, that being the determining market as to the price of beef as well as of grain. A large number of farmers, distillers and brewers are import-

ing young and lean cattle from the Western States and then exporting them. A large amount of corn is being imported, and it would confer no appreciable benefit on our farmers to have a duty on that article, while it would have the effect of stopping a great and lucrative trade. I will give you an illustration which is taken from the experience of my friend Mr. Rymal, who is himself a farmer. He took fifty or sixty bushels of barley to the Hamilton market and sold it for $1.50 a bushel. (I assume a price.) He bought the same quantity of corn for some fifty cents per bushel. He took the same number of bushels of corn back as of the barley he had brought to market. He had from it food for his cattle and had some $20 in cash besides. That is an illustration from which you will see plainly what would be the effect of protection upon the agricultural interest, and what is the effect of allowing our farmers to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest.

Nothing would give me greater pleasure or satisfaction than that I should be able to make everybody rich by protection, provided nobody had to pay for it. But it will occur to you, and to every one who considers the subject, that it is utter nonsense to talk of finding a royal road to wealth.

Wealth is only obtainable by industry, and we are not such fools as to sell peas or any other articles to the United States if we can sell it for a higher price in England. Our produce will naturally go where the highest price prevails. Prince Edward Island sells all her oats to England. We send a good

deal to the United States. We send a large quantity of peas to the United States, as well as our surplus wheat, though Dr. Tupper says we do not grow enough wheat for our own consumption. While I do not admit the accuracy of that, suppose we do not, what would happen? We would be compelled to buy some flour and wheat in a foreign market, and he thinks it would be a great benefit for us if we were compelled to buy some for our own consumption and pay taxes for it when we got it. That is his logic. Look at the matter as you please, and you will find that the only true road to national wealth for the farmer, for the mechanic, or for the manufacturer, is to remove all restrictions from trade that it is possible to remove.

I am old enough to remember the time when the great anti-corn law agitation was carried on in England. I have heard George Thompson and his compeers, Cobden and his friends, at meetings, denouncing these corn laws, which imposed a duty on wheat and other grain though they could not raise enough for their own maintenance, and I remember that the farmers were almost rioting in some districts, believing it would be ruinous to them if the duty were abolished. The fact is that they became very much more prosperous since than they had been before. At that time the average rent in England and Scotland, if not in Ireland, was about £2 sterling, and when I was in the old country in 1875, I found that the same farms rented for £3; and farm servants who had formerly been receiving £10 or £12 sterling and board,

were now receiving from £20 to £24 and board, and their houses were very much improved.

In fact, when the protection was removed, the whole agricultural interest seemed to bound forward into a state of greater prosperity, which affected landlord and tenant alike. If we are true patriots, we have to work, not for the benefit of one class, but for the benefit of the entire interests of the country which we have in our hands, and it would be an evil day for Canada if the attention of our farmers were diverted from its proper functions by their endeavoring to make money by vainly obtaining a duty in the shape of protection to cereals. It could not be done except in the single article of corn. As regards the manufacturers, as I have already told them, they might for a moment get a higher price after the duties were increased, but the effect would certainly be to introduce disorder and disorganization into our whole trade system.

You have now a 17½ per cent. tariff for revenue purposes, and if we impose more you will get a higher price for your boots and shoes, machines, etc. But we must have a revenue, and as we could not raise it on a higher tariff, you would be obliged to pay property taxes or a poll tax to make up the deficiency. There would be nothing left for us but to appoint an assessor to go round and make a direct levy on the people, and that is something which, I fancy, none of you would like to see. Apart altogether from the question of its wisdom as a fiscal policy, I am sure I have only to mention it to show that it would be

neither palatable nor convenient to you that such a system should prevail for raising a revenue. I am aware that in some counties some gentlemen are very fond of calling themselves the farmers' friends. I believe Mr. Farrow figures in this county in that capacity. Dr. Orton proposes protection as a panacea for all the ills that farmers' flesh is heir to, and I remember once giving great offence to that gentleman by saying that I thought he knew a good deal more about calomel than he did of what was good for the interest of the farmers. I am afraid these self-styled farmers' friends are rather suspicious gentlemen, and that they fancy that our farmers are a very simple lot of people. They are like the demagogue out West, who appealed to the sympathies of the farmers because, as he said, he was a farmer himself, his father was a farmer, and so was his grandfather. "In fact," he said, "I might say I was brought up between the rows of corn," when some irreverent fellow in the crowd shouted out, "A pumpkin, by thunder!" I don't want to call anyone names—but I'm half inclined to think that these two gentlemen, who so loudly proclaim themselves as par excellence the farmers' friends, will be found, if you only probe them, to be but very sorry specimens of a certain kind of vegetable. I think you will see that, to put it mildly, this remedy of theirs has a very suspicious look about it. They say, "Don't the Americans put so many cents a bushel on our wheat? Why not put as much on theirs?"

I say "Yes, by all means, if you can only get it."

I am willing to tax the Americans as much as you please, if you can only collect the tax after it is imposed. We tried it once, and the result was that a number of loads of wheat came in before the change in the tariff was known, but after that they avoided our shores, sent their wheat to England through other channels, or in bond, and so the entire amount we collected in about a year and a quarter was only about $120,000, and the next year we should have got nothing. Our canal traffic would be injured, and the mills which are built all along the frontier for the milling of United States wheat would be left idle. A miller asked me at Newmarket why we didn't give the same protection to flour that we gave to other manufactures, and I said: "Simply because it would be of no use to you. Your flour is sent to England, or to any other place where it can be sold."

"Now, suppose a duty were imposed that would enable you to go to the Lower Provinces (where they raise no grain worth mentioning, and no wheat), it could only be got in this way. The fishermen in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island have a considerable trade with Portland, Boston and other towns in the United States. They sell their fish and bring back flour, generally as ballast, carrying it for 10 or 15 cents per barrel. If we were to impose a duty of 25 or 50 cents on flour it would destroy these people's trade in time, which amounts to perhaps 40,000 or 50,000 barrels per year. To the extent of that duty on the flour which goes by Boston and New York our millers might get the advantage

and no more, and that, if spread over the millers of this country, would afford them perhaps one-ninth of a cent per barrel on the flour made in Canada." But even if it did afford them more, how can you go to work and tax the people's bread in the Lower Provinces unless you allow them to tax something elsewhere?

They tried last year to carry a tax on coal. I asked a manufacturer in Goderich, who is not a political friend of mine, how much he could get his coal delivered for at his establishment. He said $3 per ton; but if he had to take his coal from Nova Scotia he could not get it delivered below $7 per ton. Yet it was deliberately proposed that the great Province of Ontario should tax itself, injure its manufacturers, and starve out the people in our cities who use coal, by imposing a duty on that article.

As soon as you begin a system of protection for protection's sake, everybody must be protected, and then the country will be so much the worse off by doing the work of collection. Whatever policy is adopted in these matters, it should be one which affects all persons alike, and does equal justice to all classes of the community, whether farmers, mechanics or manufacturers. But there is another phase to this question. I have said to the manufacturers, "Gentlemen, if you are determined to have protection as a system, that system must extend over all."

"There are mechanics coming in thousands from England to Canada and the United States, and if you are to have protection on the articles you make, we

must have protection for our labour. We must not lower the price of wages while we raise the price of your manufactures. You must go the very foundation, and protect our labourers as well as others." I now propose to refer to two or three statements made by Sir John Macdonald at some of the recent Conservative gatherings. There is nothing, I am sure, which tells more upon the public than to find disinterested conduct on the part of Ministers and public men generally; and when Sir John said that not one of his colleagues ever accepted lucrative offices while they were ministers of the Crown, he made a statement which no doubt commended itself to the people to whom he spoke. Sir John says:—

"Sometimes they disappeared from ill-health, sometimes they could not secure their elections, and sometimes because old age had come upon them; but I don't now remember a single one of my colleagues who sought a refuge for himself in a public office after having been honoured with a seat in the Cabinet."

Now, if this statement had been strictly correct, it might have been a matter upon which they might indulge in a little self-congratulation, though, for my own part, I can see no reason why distinguished members of the Cabinet should not fill important offices in the country. But let us see how his statement tallies with the truth.

Mr. William Macdougall was a member of the Government since 1867, and he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. Mr. W. P. Howland was

a member of his Cabinet, and he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. Mr. Archibald was a member of his Government, and he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and afterwards of Nova Scotia. Alexander Morris was a member of his Government, and he was appointed Chief Justice of Manitoba, and afterwards Lieutenant-Governor of that Province. Christopher Dunkin was a member of his Cabinet, and he was appointed to a seat on the Bench. Joseph Howe, a member of his Administration, was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia. Sir Narcisse Belleau, a member of his Government, was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. Mr. Hugh Macdonald, a member of his Cabinet, was appointed a judge in Nova Scotia. Mr. Tilley was a member of his Government, and was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick; and Sir Edward Kenny, another of his colleagues, was appointed Administrator in Nova Scotia. When Sir John Macdonald ventures before any audience in Canada to make such a statement as that, he must not only have a very bad memory, but he must fancy his hearers know nothing of the political history of their country. I have given you a list of ten Cabinet Ministers who were appointed to office, being at the rate of two per year while they were in power.

What has been our record in the same respect during the four years we have been in office? We appointed Mr. Dorion Chief Justice of Quebec; Mr. D. A. Macdonald, Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario; Mr. Fournier, a Judge of the Supreme Court; Mr. Ross, Col-

lector of Customs at Halifax; Mr. David Laird, Lieutenant-Governor of the Northwest; Mr. Letellier, Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. We have made six appointments in four years; they have made ten in five years; so that they made at the rate of two per year—we made at the rate of one and a half per year, of the very class of appointments which he condemns. Now, I don't condemn it.

I think, for example, it was extremely fitting that such a man as Mr. Dorion should be made Chief Justice of his native Province. I think he was more entitled to such honour than any man then in public life. His name I can scarcely mention without a feeling of reverence, for if ever I had a sincere affection for one of my own sex—I have had an affection for the other—I had that affection for Mr. Dorion. A man so pure-minded, so religious, so devoted to his country, so disinterested, I have never known in my whole political life, and, sir, even this man has been assailed over and over again in the grossest and most virulent style by the leaders of the Opposition. Mr. D. A. Macdonald was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. He was a distinguished Catholic, a native of Glengarry, where his grandfather was born. It was supposed by some people that because he was a Roman Catholic his name should be received with disfavor; but I am proud to say that no man could have more successfully performed the duties of his office than he has done, and that no one deserved his office better. So with the rest of the appointments I have named. I might name others made by them before

Confederation, but during the time Sir John was either Premier or a leading man in the Government.

They appointed Mr. Draper a judge, Mr. Vankoughnet a judge, Mr. Morin a judge; Mr. Morrisson and Mr. Sherwood were made judges, and Mr. Spence a Collector of Customs. All these gentlemen were members of Conservative Administrations, so that we have here a list of sixteen of such appointments as those to which Sir John referred, and all made within a comparatively short space of time. And yet Sir John told you the other day that he did not remember a single member of his party who had accepted a lucrative office after being a Cabinet Minister.

At another meeting Sir John undertook to jeer at the legislation of the Reform Government, and Dr. Tupper very coolly told the people that the measures we passed were measures that they had prepared and left in their pigeon-holes when they left office. Well, I can but say that the only things that we found in their pigeon-holes—and we found them in very great abundance—were appointments to office, made after they had lost the confidence of Parliament. They did not leave a single measure of any kind, prepared or partly prepared, from which we derived a particle of benefit.

I may tell you that instead of leaving measures partly prepared, they seemed to have occupied their time during the year before they went out of office—and when they must have known that a cloud was hanging over their heads and likely to burst upon them with extreme violence—in preparing every con-

ceivable sort of scheme for keeping themselves in power; and during the last month of their regime, when they found they had no hope of remaining in power, they created offices by the score and by the hundred.

You will find in the records that are published, that on the last day before they had given up the ship they had made many appointments, and they deliberately altered the date of the letters to make them look as if written upon the 6th instead of the 7th. Did this gentleman who never appointed one of his Cabinet to office remember when he made that statement that on the 22nd of October, 1873, the very day on which Parliament met, he appointed one of his colleagues, Mr. Tilley, to a Lieutenant-Governorship?

That the Government hung on for two weeks after that time, but the appointment remained, and that the very day they went out, Mr. Tilley, after telling the House that he intended resuming the debate next day, got his commission and walked off—a Lieutenant-Governor?

Mr. Hugh Macdonald at the same time had his appointment as a judge in Nova Scotia; he kept sitting in the House with Mr. Tilley, though, like him, he knew his appointment was made. The only thing necessary was the signing of the commission, and it was signed the same day. Yet the leader of these two gentlemen tells us that for the life of him he cannot call to mind a member of his Government who accepted an office! Sir John says that for long years he was occupied in introducing the civil and criminal

laws which were to govern the country; that many of these laws the then Opposition strenuously and factiously opposed; and that many of our laws are but copies of old legislation.

Well, this is a pretty extensive statement—even for Sir John Macdonald. I can only say that a great many of the laws which he says he spent long years in elaborating were copied by the clerks in his office, with some slight amendments from English laws. None of the laws to which he refers were original, but they were merely copied into Dominion statutes. Up to the time that any particular law was changed, the old laws prevailing in the Province of Canada continued to have force, and as soon as they were enacted in the Dominion books they became Dominion statutes. What he did was simply to introduce the old statutes, making such amendments as were necessary in the new state of affairs. He says we opposed him "factiously and strenuously." Well, if he is to hold any more meetings I would like him to take the journals of the House and the reports of the debates with him, and show the public from the records a single one of these laws that we opposed factiously and strenuously.

Let him point out one that we opposed at all. Why should we oppose criminal laws which we must have? Instead of doing anything of the kind, we devoted ourselves as an Opposition to cementing the new system, and I was repeatedly complimented, as Mr. Huntington and other members of the House will remember, as the "distinguished member for Lamb-

ton," because I assisted them when some of my colleagues were not very strongly disposed to do so. The statement is utterly devoid of truth; it is just as far from the facts as his statement that we used their measures, and that we did not repeal any of them.

When we came into office we found that four commissioners were conducting the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway, one on a salary of $4,000 a year, and the others on a salary of $3,000 a year, one of them being a member of Parliament. I introduced an Act at once to abolish the Commission and make it a duty of the Minister of Public Works to conduct the Intercolonial Railway as a public work of Canada, and we saved by that means the sum of $10,000 per year.

So we passed laws relating to the Military College, we amended the Libel Law, passed the new Building Societies Act, the Registration of Shipping Bill, and the Supreme Court Bill. Let me say a word or two about the last named of these.

Sir John said at some meeting that he had prepared the Supreme Court Bill. He never prepared a Bill of any sort about the Supreme Court, but he did pay a Toronto Judge $500 to prepare a Bill, which we did not accept, though we had as good a right to use it as they, seeing that the country paid for the Bill. That law was promised several times, but they never were strong enough or determined enough to pass it. They had an Opposition to it in Lower Canada which they could not overcome. We passed it at once, thus providing in a broad, patriot-

ic sense for a final Court of Appeal in our own country, instead of sending litigants to England, where many of our comparatively poor people had been ruined, and where the rich had almost a certainty of winning against the poor suitors. Sir John and his friends factiously opposed the measure. They tried to prevent it being made a final Court of Appeal, and at one of his meetings last year, thinking he had the secret ear of the Colonial Office, that he could move the strings in England, he told the people that a little bird had whispered to him that our Act would be disallowed.

But that little bird is something like some Tory leaders. It could not, or does not, always tell what is exactly true. Our Act has not been disallowed, but, on the contrary, it is the admiration of English and Canadian lawyers for its completeness, and it has been eminently successful in its operation.

I forgot to tell you how often an Election Law was promised by the late Government. They mentioned it in the speech from the Throne about five times. They introduced one once, but it was such an abortion that none of their own friends would have anything to do with it, and the brat was quickly put out of the way.

They promised repeatedly to introduce an Insolvency Act. They got Mr. John Abbott, a prominent man on the Conservative side, to introduce one, the Ministry conveniently shirking responsibility in the matter of getting one of their supporters to introduce the Bill. When they had succeeded in carrying it

they said, "Well, didn't we do that splendidly?" They say we only amended the Insolvency Law. They had none to amend. The law did not in any sense belong to them, and they are trying to assume the parentage of a respectable infant, when they had murdered their own. We promised the Bill, we introduced it at once, and passed it, assuming the responsibility ourselves, though I am bound to say it is an extremely difficult matter to satisfy the public on a question of insolvency.

Sir John received an ovation from the working men on the strength of a law which he passed, and which he claimed was to save them from a great deal of annoyance, but they found that instead of protecting them it resulted in their persecution; but Mr. Irving and Mr. Blake prepared a Bill, which was amended last session, and which provides for the same freedom of contract between man and master as in any other case. Then we have a law relating to corrupt practices at elections, such as will have the effect of securing purity of election.

So with the question of extradition. That has been in the hands of Mr. Blake, and, as you all know, there is no man in Canada more competent to deal with such a subject. Our Act of last session is the first complete Canadian Act on the subject of extradition, and it will effectually prevent the evil of making the United States a harbour of refuge for the criminals of this country, and the evil of making Canada the resort of runaway criminals from the other side of the line.

If you look at the journals of the House, you will also see that the subject of maritime jurisdiction on our lakes has also been dealt with by some of the lawyers; for our inland marine was subjected to certain inequalities which were not felt by our ocean marine, which was governed by the British Admiralty laws.

We also dealt with fire and life insurance, and many other subjects of more or less importance. We are quite willing to submit our legislation to the intelligent consideration of the people of Canada.